HARVARD UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Volume XVII Number 1/2 June 1993

Ukrainian Research Institute
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ISSN 0363–5570

Published by the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Printed by BookCrafters, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in *Historical Abstracts* and *America: History and Life.*

CONTENTS

REVIEWS

CHRONICLE

CONTRIBUTORS

Alexander Grishin is reader in art history at Australian National University, Canberra.

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted is a research associate at the Ukrainian Research Institute and a fellow of the Russian Research Center, Harvard University.

William Noll is lecturer at the Tchaikovsky Music Conservatory and co-director of the Center for the Study of Oral History and Culture, Kiev.

A. B. Pernal is professor of history at Brandon University, Brandon, Manitoba.

Marko Pavlyshyn is Mykola Zerov Senior Lecturer in Ukrainian and Head of Slavic Studies at Monash University, Melbourne.

Volodymyr Mezentsev is a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council grant recipient at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto.

Borys Gudziak is Director of the Institute of Church History and Vice-Rector, L'viv Theological Academy.

I. S. Koropeckyj is professor emeritus of economics at Temple University.

Emanuela Sgambati is professor at the Department of Slavic Studies and East-Central Europe at the University of Rome "La Sapienza."

Vasyl' Hryhorovyč Bars'kyj: An Eighteenth-Century Ukrainian Pilgrim in Italy

ALEXANDER GRISHIN

Vasyl' Hryhorovyč Bars'kyj's *Stranstvovanija*[1] has long been known as a valuable historical source to historians, art historians, and archaeologists. As an antiquarian Bars'kyj was outstanding for his time. His detailed descriptions and painstakingly accurate drawings of churches in many instances are either our earliest, or sometimes our only, records of the original appearance of buildings, some of which are no longer extant. The record is invaluable especially for Greece, Cyprus, and Athos. When he visited monastic libraries he not only compiled checklists of rare and unusual documents, but also transcribed the colophons, copied out the imperial chrysobulls and gave conservation reports on the state of the manuscripts. Such details are found in abundance in his accounts of the libraries of Sinai and Athos. As an epigrapher he was exacting when transcribing the languages that he knew, which included Greek, Latin, Slavic languages, Arabic, and Turkish. Of those languages with which he was not familiar, such as ancient Egyptian, he faithfully copied the hieroglyphs, making some of the earliest accurate transcriptions ever attempted. He was also an acute observer of church liturgy, not only providing us with detailed descriptions of who stood where during the liturgy and an account of the liturgical texts employed, but also providing sketched ground plans of the churches and the exact position of each participant. A catalogue of Bars'kyj's interests would be encyclopedic, including such subjects as town planning, monastic economies, foreign currencies and exchange rates, folk customs, traditional dress, folk rituals and folk arts, organization of educational institutions, church politics, ecclesiastical dress, and the mechanics of early eighteenth-century pilgrimage.[2]

Rather than attempting to note what could be called highlights from Bars'kyj's twenty-four years of pilgrimage between 1723 and 1747, this paper concentrates on Bars'kyj's first year of pilgrimage in Italy. This material is virtually unknown,[3] because even those scholars familiar with Bars'kyj's manuscript were quick to realize that his observations in 1724 were not a unique archeological record of previously unrecorded churches and monasteries, that in fact he belonged at the tail end of a very extensive pilgrimage literature for Italy.[4] Also, apart from anything else, his lack of knowledge of the Italian language, his status as a mendicant pilgrim who spent more time begging for alms than examining the sacred sites, and his general lack of sympathy for anything that was Roman Catholic, made it into a seriously flawed and at times wildly inaccurate account.[5] It is not my purpose to take issue with such an assessment, but rather to present a reading of Bars'kyj's account of Italy and to interrogate it insofar as it tells us about Bars'kyj, his values, and the values of the early eighteenth-century Kievan society from which he emerged. I shall also attempt to take a glance into what

could be called the mind of the pilgrim traveler. Frequently it is as significant to note what Bars'kyj omits to mention in his narrative, as it is to catalogue what is included. For example, for Bars'kyj the pilgrim, the sole point of interest in the church of San Pietro in Vincoli lay with the relics, the chains with which it was thought that Saint Peter had been bound, while Michelangelo's *Moses* and the tomb of Pope Julius II do not rate a mention. From this, one need not draw the overhasty conclusion that Bars'kyj lacked an interest in the visual arts. His account of San Marco in Venice, for example, includes a discussion of both the mosaics and the bronze horses. In this instance, apparently, the criterion for the inclusion or exclusion of church art was theological. He viewed the Michelangelo sculpture as a Roman Catholic work and omitted it, while he saw the mosaics with their Greek inscriptions as living proof that the church was originally Greek Orthodox before being taken over by the Catholics, and included them in that context.[6] Likewise, it is important to note and to understand Bars'kyj's misinterpretations, as frequently they cast more light on his convictions and those of his society, than do the things that he repeats accurately from common sources.

Bars'kyj[7] was born into a wealthy merchant's family in Kiev, probably in 1701. His younger brother, Ivan, was to become a distinguished architect of the Ukrainian late baroque. When he was in his teens he entered the Kiev Academy, apparently against his father's wishes, but supported by his mother. He stayed there for half a dozen years, mastering Latin, until some sort of ulcer on his leg forced him to abandon his studies.[8] Using the twin opportunities of the absence of his father from the city on a business trip, and the journey by one of his co-students Iustyn Lenneckij, Bars'kyj beseeched his mother to give him some money so that he could go to L'viv on the pretext of seeking a cure for his leg, but also wishing desperately to continue his studies at the renowned L'viv Jesuit Academy. On 20 July 1723, he and his friend Iustyn left Kiev. For Bars'kyj this was the commencement of a pilgrimage which was to last twenty-four years. When he finally returned to Kiev in 1747, his health was broken and he died barely a month later, unable to revise, edit, or publish his manuscript.

In L'viv he did find an instant cure for his leg and did gain admission to the prestigious Jesuit Academy, but it was only through feigning to be a Roman Catholic.[9] Through various circumstances the true nature of his faith was suspected and he was expelled. Although later he was re-admitted under protest, he felt vulnerable. He said to his traveling companion, "Will not those who hate us set another trap for us, more dangerous than the first ... will they not test our faith?"[10] Less than nine months after arriving in L'viv, the two young lay students set off on their pilgrimage to Italy, as Bars'kyj put it, to worship at the holy shrines and "to see new cities, different people and different customs."[11]

Bars'kyj's pilgrimage and travel journal need to be seen in the context of other travelers of the Petrine period. In 1717, Feofan Prokopovyč preached in favor of travel abroad as part of a sound education and argued that a sensible man "sees also in foreign nations, as in a mirror, himself and his own people, both their good

points and their bad..."[12] Secular travel for self-enlightenment prompted a new literature of travel notes, which co-existed with the more traditional written pilgrim accounts. Bars'kyj's journal belongs to this latter category, and from the outset he adhered to a pilgrim's travel journal format with opening prayers and listing of holy sites and sacred relics, but wrote it in a diary-like sequence incorporating personal responses to the actual journey with a description of the hardships of travel. Parallels can be drawn with other contemporary pilgrim accounts such as those by Hieromonk Ippolit Vyšens'kyj from Kiev, who made his pilgrimage in 1707–09;[13] Andrej Ignat'ev, a Moscow priest, who made his pilgrimage in 1707; Hieromonk Varlaam, from the Kievan Caves Monastery, who made his pilgrimage in 1712; Hieromonk Makarij from Novgorod, who made his pilgrimage in 1704–07; and the monk Serapion from the Saint Matrona-Trinity Monastery near Čyhyryn, who made his pilgrimage between 1749 and 1751.[14]

For an understanding of Bars'kyj's reaction to Italy, several factors need to be kept in mind. First, we are reading the reactions of a young man, about twenty-two years old, with a fairly limited education, but with strong theistic convictions, who had emerged from a background of struggle with the Uniates and who had experienced persecution by the Roman Catholic Church. Second, Bars'kyj was a mendicant pilgrim, who had no financial resources and needed to beg for food, shelter, and money to keep himself alive. He managed to survive in this manner fairly successfully for almost a quarter of a century, but it was during this early part of the pilgrimage that he experienced the most acute poverty. Third, Bars'kyj both realized and acknowledged that he was a "stranger," a traveler in what was often a hostile environment, lacking money and the local language for communication, and by necessity dressed in the garb of a Catholic pilgrim en route to Rome to obtain the patents and alms. After the separation with his traveling companion Iustyn, in Barletta, Bars'kyj traveled alone, and the internal dialogue was heightened, as were his phobias, apprehensions, and his conviction in the active intervention of Divine Providence in all his actions.

With regard to the physical journey, Bars'kyj's route was somewhat unusual. On leaving L'viv, which was then part of the Polish Commonwealth, he traveled through Slovakia, Hungary, and Austria, and then to the port of Portogruaro, where he begged and received free passage on a boat bound for Venice. On 27 June 1724 he arrived in Venice, and for the purposes of this paper, we can take this date for the commencement of his Italian pilgrimage. From Venice he walked to Padua, then on to Ferrara, Bologna, Ancona on the Adriatic coast, and on to the Marian shrine at Loreto. From there he took the difficult and little used coastal track to Bari, which was to be the major highlight of his Italian pilgrimage. At this stage, tensions with his traveling companion had come to a peak and they parted in Barletta, where Bars'kyj stayed for several days in a successful attempt to regain his patents, which he had lost while scaling vineyard walls at night to steal grapes. From Barletta he walked alone to Naples and on to Rome, which he reached on 29 August—roughly two months after setting out from Venice. From Rome he

took the main road through Florence and back to Bologna, Ferrara, and on to Venice, which he reached on 6 October 1724. After failing to beg his way onto a ship going to Zadar on the Dalmatian coast, he settled in for the winter in Venice at the Orthodox hospice of San Giorgio dei Greci, where he commenced his study of Greek. Bars'kyj left Venice on 28 February 1725, never to return to Italy. Thus, the period under consideration lasted for about three and a half months spent walking through northern, central, and southern Italy, and about four and a half months of residence in Venice.

Initially, Bars'kyj's travel journal was written during this period as a series of diary-like entries, with frequent asides like "there I sat until evening writing about my journey,"[15] while the last section, from Bari to Rome and back to Venice, was probably composed in Venice from travel notes, and is often punctuated with careless inconsistencies, as in the correlation of dates with days of the week. The journal was written with publication in mind, using the out-of-fashion but still popular genre of pilgrim travel literature, with recurring references to "my dear patient reader." There is also evidence that Bars'kyj intended to revise and edit the journal, with marginal notes addressed to himself, reminding him to check certain dates and figures. Fortunately for us, he never made these revisions, and the lacunae remain, as do the rawness and freshness of the observations.

I will divide my observations into four main sections: Bari, Rome, Florence, and Venice. Unlike most pilgrims traveling to Italy, who placed Rome and the shrines of the Apostles at the top of their itinerary, Bars'kyj originally justified the whole pilgrimage by his desire to worship at the shrine of Saint Nicholas in Bari:

> I did not so much wish to go to Rome, as to the shrine of the Holy Bishop Saint Nicholas in the town of Bari. When I was still attempting to heal the huge ulcer on my leg ... I made a vow to God that if healed I would undertake a distant journey in gratitude for His mercy.[16]

Why he held Saint Nicholas in such veneration is never fully explained. Of course, the cult of Saint Nicholas was very popular in Ukraine, where the first church was dedicated to him in Kiev in 882, if the Nestor Chronicle is to be trusted.[17] Perhaps more significantly, Christianity was introduced to the Slav peoples at a time when the cult of Saint Nicholas was at its peak in Byzantium, and the Slavs adopted him as part of the foundations of their faith. In the eighteenth century, the cult was an integral part of the faith, and there may be nothing remarkable in Bars'kyj's vow to make a pilgrimage to the shrine of Saint Nicholas at Bari if cured of his ulcer. One could speculate that there was more of a personal commitment and point to the fact that the name Bars'kyj was associated indirectly with the cult and was derived from the name of the town of Bar in western Ukraine. Formerly known as Rov, it was renamed in 1537 by Queen Bona Sforza, the wife of the Polish King Sigismund I, in memory of her Italian possessions in Bari. This, of course, would be only speculation.

The shrine of Saint Nicholas at Bari is a perfect candidate for what the sociologist Dean MacCannell described as a holy site. He outlined the steps in the

process of creation of a holy site. First, the site is purified of extraneous associations. The second stage is its "sacralization"—when it is marked off, elevated, and separated from its surroundings. It is at this stage that it may be architecturally "framed." Third, the site is mechanically reproduced in effigies, pictures, models, relics, souvenirs, and icons, by means of which its fame and reputation are spatially extended. Fourth, there is the stage of "social reproduction" of the site which, if successful, gathers a community around it and makes it a self-sufficient economic entity. The site continues as long as it can generate a literature—texts, guidebooks, testimonies, miracles, and travel accounts.[18] MacCannell of course had in mind not religious shrines, but secular ones, such as the Empire State Building in New York, and the factors that made them into economically viable tourist attractions. The translation of Saint Nicholas's relics from Turkish-occupied Myra to Bari in 1087 is well attested in contemporary sources and could be viewed as a process of purification. Within a couple of years, a tomb with the saint's bones was well embedded in the crypt of a vast basilica erected in the saint's honor; thus, the territory had been architecturally "marked off" and framed.[19] Saint Nicholas's fame as a miracle-worker was closely linked with his function as a myroblate—that is, a saint whose relics unceasingly emit a myrrh, *manna*, or sacred liquid, with miraculous medicinal qualities. While the myrrh was distributed free, it could only be collected in special phials exclusively sold by merchants associated with the church, permitting the church to maintain a monopoly over the relic and its miracles.[20] Thus, very early in its life the church became a self-sufficient economic entity, attracted a vast number of pilgrims or tourists, and generated a considerable quantity of promotional literature, produced both on its own behalf and by impressed travelers.

Bars'kyj arrived at the shrine of Saint Nicholas in no need of conversion. He knew that the site was holy, and that the saint's powers were great: throughout the pilgrimage he had called on him for help. Recently he had suffered great hardships, walking along the rocky shores for days, exhausted by the summer heat and suffering from lack of food and water. When walking at night he had lost his travel documents, his patents, and also experienced great pain in his legs, so that he lamented that he could hardly walk. It is interesting to examine his response upon reaching his destination. On his arrival in Bari, Bars'kyj was entitled to three nights' free accommodation at the local hospice for pilgrims, and appears to have divided his days between begging for alms around town and going to the church of San Nicola. He provides us with a brief description of the church, including such details as its basic two-story structure, the two sets of stairs leading down to the crypt with the relics, the number of columns in the crypt, and a description of the tomb of the holy bishop.[21] He excludes all that is extraneous to the functioning of the cult, so that the huge sixteenth-century tomb of Bona Sforza (the queen who renamed Rov as Bar), an eyesore that dominates the entire upper church, does not get a passing mention. In Dean MacCannell's terminology, Bars'kyj is solely concerned with that which "sacralizes" the site, and not in its physical appearance.

Initially, in keeping with convention, Bars'kyj lists some of the main features of the cult and its associated miracles. Then he breaks with the established *topoi* of pilgrim tales, proceeding to observe the cult from what could be termed an "objective" viewpoint. It is here that the traveling stranger, the outsider, is simultaneously the passionate believer within his own culture, and the impartial observer in the one within which he travels. After the account of the church and the miracles, he brings up the pivotal question of the holy myrrh, which he calls the holy manna, from the Italian *Manna di San Nicola* with which the priests anoint the heads of the worshippers:

> Near the church there were four shops which sold glass phials and different images and icons, all depicting the Holy Bishop Saint Nicholas...The production of these phials is paid for by the church and the money gathered from their sale is returned to the church administration...They distribute ample amounts of manna to anyone who asks for it, but only provided that it is placed into phials bought in the church shop with an image of Saint Nicholas on them, but never into any others. We asked...how much manna do the relics of Saint Nicholas exude....[The priest] answered us, that every morning the tomb is full and that what is distributed during the day is replaced in the night...We also heard that before his feast day, two or three days earlier, sometimes an abundance of manna appears, and at other times only a little. From this without fail they can calculate that when there is much manna, there will be a gathering of a great multitude of Christians in the church, but if only a little manna has appeared, there will be a small gathering of people. The sagacious Holy Bishop exudes only as much of the healing manna as the faithful will require.[22]

At this point in the text there follows a catalogue of the saint's miracles that are testified to in the church. Thus, for example, the saint, noticing that the builders of the church were one column short of completing the crypt, appeared with a couple of angels and the additional column. The church also contained the image of a ship which the saint had saved from destruction, a huge bone from a fish which the saint had helped a fisherman to land, and a tusk, apparently taken from an elephant shot by a hunter who had said a prayer to the saint.

What disturbed Bars'kyj more than anything else was that he had not seen and physically touched the relics of the saint, nor witnessed the miracle of the holy myrrh. His persistence with the Latin-speaking clergy paid off, however, and he and his traveling companion were invited into the church one night after vespers to be shown what could be termed the inside workings of the cultus. As far as can be established, this account is rare in the voluminous pilgrim and travelers' tales associated with the Saint Nicholas shrine:[23]

> After that, he led us to the church, which I have mentioned before, and which lies below the vault of the upper church, and to the great altar of silver, and opened in the front of it a small door through which a person could crawl like a worm. The sacristan crawled into it first, up to his waist, and he lit a small lamp so that one could see inside. After him, I the sinful one crawled in next...In the upper marble slab, there was cut a small round window

which could be covered by a [small coin like a] thaler. Suspended through this window was an iron chain with a candle on it hanging deep inside, almost near the floor of the tomb. Having crawled inside, I placed one eye over this hole and could see inside a very deep marble sarcophagus, about a cubit off the ground, like a well half-filled with water or manna, which was light and transparent like the clearest water, and through it, under the surface of the water, there appeared something like bones on which moisture endlessly formed as if drops of perspiration. There was no flesh, and they say that it had all dissolved into the manna, and one could not tell which bone belonged to which part of the body, as they were not lying in their usual formation.[24]

Next Barsˈkyj allowed his traveling companion, Iustyn, to have a look, and then returned for a second look.

Finally, I asked a guard at the tomb, that if the tomb was never opened, then how did they extract the manna? He answered, that it was done through that little window, where with a special instrument they suck out the manna.[25]

Having attained his aim and examined the evidence, Barsˈkyj solemnly concludes: "I did not think that they were real bones, but that they had been carefully carved out of that very same marble, and so, too, thought Iustyn."[26] The point is not elaborated, nor does he return to it in the text or explain its significance for the cult in Bari. Immediately after witnessing the manna, he simply notes that they left Bari just before sunset.

An interesting parallel can be drawn with the slightly earlier account found in the travel diary of Pëtr Tolstoj, who arrived in Bari in June 1698. He traveled in comfort with his entourage by ship, and when he arrived in Bari was greeted by the representatives of the local governor. He presents an architecturally accurate account of the church with a summary of the miracles of the saint as provided by the local guides, explains how the holy manna is obtained and distributed to the pilgrims, lists the other relics in the church, and complains that "there are only a few shops in Bari, with few goods in them."[27] Tolstoj, aged 53, well funded, reasonably well educated and traveling on a mission for Tsar Peter, appears as the impartial observer who repeats uncritically that which he is told and reports without particular emotion that which he observes. For Barsˈkyj, by contrast, both the physical and the spiritual pilgrimage involve a process of struggle with a need to verify and to authenticate.

Barsˈkyj's circumstances changed as he traveled to Rome. After leaving Bari, in Barletta, he finally parted company with his friend Iustyn. After several pages of moaning on how deserted and alone he feels, the "we" of the text changes to a solitary "I." No longer does he seek confirmation of his opinions from a fellow traveler from his own society with its common cultural values.[28] This slight shift in emphasis, with a growing focus on the self, is already perceptible in the subheadings that he gives in the manuscript. In place of headings such as "Calabria"

or "Description of the town of Bari," there appear headings like "Concerning the famous city of Rome and my arrival in it." The sense of alienation—the character of "detachment" and "objectivity"—is heightened as Bars'kyj's journey progresses. Increasingly he sees himself as "outside" something:

> The world becomes an array of "objects," artifacts, and exemplars whose meaning is mysterious to the outsider and must be decoded from appearances. Through being removed, one may come to see one's native culture—which once provided the lenses and meanings through which one looked out upon the world—as an object, a thing, a unified, describable phenomenon.[29]

Bars'kyj's account was to some extent determined by the sheer mechanics of the pilgrimage. In Bari, with access to a single hospice, Bars'kyj could stay for three nights and produced material for six folios in the manuscript. With the much greater range of pilgrim hospices in Rome, Bars'kyj stayed for twelve days and gathered material for fifteen tightly written folios of text. In Rome he felt drawn to catalogue and to explain everything that he encountered—customs, ruins, Roman history, rituals, and so on.[30] In terms of the empirical data provided, Bars'kyj's account of Rome provides little that could be described as new or archeologically interesting, even though the events to which he was an eyewitness did offer him a rare perspective.[31] In Rome he encountered many unfamiliar phenomena which, with an amazing single-mindedness, he translated into experiences known to him. For example, Bars'kyj's paradigm for Rome was the history of the city of L'viv, which was once free, Orthodox and Ukrainian, and then suffered forced conversion to Catholicism and Polish domination. According to Bars'kyj, Rome too was once a Greek city ruled by Greek emperors and true to the Greek Orthodox faith, and only some time after Emperor Constantine shifted his capital to Constantinople did the Italians and the Roman Catholics appear and convert the churches to their own rite. According to Bars'kyj,

> Rome is a very ancient city, not ancient through weakness or through being dilapidated,[32] but ancient in years, as it was already founded by the Greeks long before Christ. It is an imperial city and had on its throne Greek emperors in ancient times, such as Titus, Vespasian and others. The last emperor to have his throne there was the pious Constantine, who moved it to Byzantium, which is now called Constantinople.[33]

Bars'kyj's explanations are ingenious and lend the text a certain naive charm:

> There is also another church within the city which is called the Rotunda,[34] meaning round, as the building is round on the inside and on the outside. It has no corners or rooms, but only a single wall which goes all around, like a column, and it is covered by a single dome. It is very ancient and was created by the Greeks[35] for all their gods, that is, it was a pagan temple for their idols to whom they made sacrifices on a huge fire in the middle of the church on which they burnt bodies. For this reason there is a window, or a great hole,

in the middle of the church dome, through which the smoke could escape, and this hole still remains uncovered. When Rome became holy and Christian and all the pagan temples were cleared of their idols, then this church was called All Saints.[36]

Regarding the alleged purpose of his pilgrimage to Rome, the churches and their relics, Bars'kyj boasts that "there is a common tradition among pilgrims, that on reaching Rome you visit many churches... But there are seven great and leading churches, which if anyone does not visit, he cannot be deemed a worshipper and he has come and gone in vain."[37] Yet his account of the seven pilgrim churches is brief, confused, and at times inaccurate. He does not even mention Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, which was mandatory for all good pilgrims. His chief lament is the lack of access to the relics except every twenty-five years, in the Jubilee year, which to Bars'kyj's misfortune was only the following year, 1725.

In terms of materials and observations, Bars'kyj's contribution lies in his description of the mechanics of pilgrimage in Rome, from the perspective of the traveling mendicant pilgrim. We learn much about the physical geography and the administration of hospices for travelers, especially the famous *Santissima Trinita de' Pellegrini*,[38] and their arrangements for feeding the poor and the ill, the arrangement of the refectory and the dormitories, and the processes used to screen pilgrims' credentials. There is also a discussion of which monasteries made food available to paupers on what days of the week, and the fountains that had good drinking water and those that did not.

Two significant events punctuated Bars'kyj's stay in Rome, and both yielded peculiar and somewhat unexpected results. The first was an invitation to dine at the pope's table at the papal palace; the second was witnessing the confirmation of the Dominican pope, Benedict XIII. In Rome there was a practice for a papal representative each day to select twelve pilgrims and one pauper, and to invite them to dine at the papal palace, with the obvious symbolic parallel with the Apostles. Standing outside his hospice, Bars'kyj was spotted by the papal representative and invited to come the following day to dine at the papal palace. His account is interesting for all the details that it omits. We learn almost nothing about the layout of the palace, the other people present, or what one could call "local color," in which Bars'kyj's manuscript generally excels. The whole event is portrayed in ethical terms, as yet another trial of Bars'kyj's true faith. The invitation was to come to dine on Wednesday evening, and it struck him that in Kiev the Orthodox treat this day as a meat-free day, while the Catholics do not: "I was afraid that they would offer inappropriate food and I prayed to God to protect me from the snares of the enemy."[39] God of course intervened, for by coincidence that Wednesday was the day preceding the feast of the Veneration of the Holy Cross, and hence was a Vigil, which by Roman practice was commemorated by a fast. Thus only lenten food was served, and our traveler's true faith was neither tested nor exposed. Beyond this, Bars'kyj only gives us a few details of the trinkets offered to the pilgrims on leaving the table as evidence of their visit.

The papal confirmation incident yielded a no less surprising account. Apart from a rather inaccurate description of the papal procession[40]—which Bars'kyj obviously watched from the crowd, lacking a privileged position or access to information with which he could interpret the proceedings—the focus of the account is on the distribution of papal charity to the paupers of Rome, something which he obviously experienced at first hand:

> The pope three days prior to his confirmation, gathered all the beggars and paupers into his courtyard and gave each an equal amount in alms. To men and to the women, to the big and to the small, he gave each ten *baiòcchi*, which when converted into Polish money is worth four *grosz*es and in Moscow coins it is worth eight kopecks.[41] But he did not give it in silver or copper coins, as it would have taken a long time to calculate the amount for a crowd of about three or four thousand poor, and where would he have obtained such a quantity of coins? Instead he gathered all the poor into the courtyard [of the papal palace], and then let them out one by one, and as each left he gave he gave them a docket or a ticket,[42] that is, a small piece of paper in which that pauper is referred to a specific baker and on presentation of this ticket is given ten *biaòcchi* worth of bread. On this ticket it is stated in the following terms: that this pauper, the name indicated, is being sent to you baker, name indicated, in such a parish or at a specific address, and you must give him ten *baiòcchi* worth of bread and accept this ticket in lieu of the money. Then each pauper on having received this ticket went to the baker whose name was printed on it, and the baker gave each pauper ten loaves of bread and retained the dockets, and took them later to the papal palace where he received his money.[43]

While I have not encountered a similar account in other pilgrim tales, the literature for Rome for this period is immense, and it seems unlikely that Bars'kyj has unearthed any particular nuggets of information here. What is interesting is that unlike a "good tourist" who is impressed by the unfamiliar and parrots the formulas,[44] Bars'kyj adopts the perspective of the lone traveling stranger for whom the unknown provokes the need for an interpretation in terms of the known. For him, alienation underscores a confrontation and a desire to explain in terms of Kievan society and its values, religious conventions, and convictions.

Bars'kyj's account of his visit to early eighteenth-century Florence is unusual when placed in the context of those of other travelers of this time. While there may be nothing remarkable about his preoccupation with the fifteenth century when discussing Florence, Bars'kyj's preoccupation is with a fifteenth-century Church gathering, and not with the great cultural events associated with the so-called Italian Renaissance. The only reference to the physicality of the place is the sentence, "In Florence the largest and the most attractive church is called Sancta Maria Liberata and next to it is a high and beautiful stone bell tower which has been created with great skill."[45] The reference is obviously to the cathedral, Santa Maria del Fiore, and Giotto's campanile, but neither is graced by a description. Bars'kyj's discussion of the Council of Florence of 1439 is short enough to quote in full:

Florence is the city in which took place the Eighth Council (which the Eastern Church does not recognize), which was assembled through the initiative of and funding by the pope in Rome, who wanted to create the union of the Churches. They first gathered at Ferrara, as it is close to the sea, and then shifted to Florence as is recorded in the chronicles. Present at this council was the Greek Emperor John Palaeologus, Pope Eugene IV, the Patriarch Joseph, Isidore, the Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus', Mark of Ephesus and other Greek archbishops and bishops, archimandrites and leading presbyters[46] and hegumens from the Holy Mountain, Mount Athos. All signed in favour of the union, except for Mark of Ephesus alone, and it was this that prevented the Greek Church from entering the union, and until the present day it remains separate from the Romans. At the conclusion of the Council in Florence, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph, who was sitting there and taking notes, because of his insolence dropped dead, as a sign from God that He opposed the union. The patriarch, together with the emperor were the first to sign the union, and the others followed. This happened on 9 June, according to the Roman calendar, or 29 May, according to the Greek calendar, and he was buried with great honors in the church of Sancta Maria Novella, which is a monastery of the Dominican Order in which the pope resided. The Council finished in the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord, 1439, on 6 June, according to the Roman calendar, or 26 May, according to the Greek.[47]

It is not difficult to note some confusion in Bars'kyj's account. The translation of dates into the Julian calendar as then used in Kiev as if they were eighteenth-century and not fifteenth-century dates, by subtracting rather than adding the eleven days, is simply a case of a naive slip.[48] The fact that the Council finished on 6 July 1439, and not on 6 June, is a slightly more serious matter, in that the unfortunate Joseph II, the Patriarch of Constantinople, could hardly have been a signatory if he had died a month earlier. In fact he did die, and was not a signatory, but his actual date of death is a matter of more than passing interest. Bars'kyj appears to have misunderstood the reasons why the patriarch had been damned by the Orthodox polemicists. It was not because he allegedly had signed the decree of union, or that together with his emperor, in some aspects, he had argued in favor of the union. Rather, it was because he allegedly had left a document usually referred to as the *Last Profession,* allegedly signed on his deathbed, in which he basically agreed with the Latins' interpretation of the *Filioque*. Church historians of the past hundred years have argued at length over the authenticity of the *Last Profession* text, generally with the Roman Catholics, such as the eminent Jesuit Father Joseph Gill,[49] arguing for its authenticity, and Orthodox scholars, including Ivan Ostroumoff,[50] arguing against it. The issue is complicated, but in the final analysis the most telling contradiction is that the Latin Act reproduces the so-called *Last Profession* with a date of 9 June 1439, stating that he wrote it and died that evening, and then proceeds to give the date of death as 10 June. The contradiction is difficult to resolve; Father Gill's ingenious explanation is to say, "It is just as possible that the Patriarch himself was in error about the date. That does happen even to the best of us."[51] For Orthodox theologians it is a clear-cut case: it is simply "an unsuccessful forgery made by some Greek or Latin to allure the Orthodox."[52] Here Bars'kyj's testimony that the patriarch died on 9 June would

be interesting if we could determine his source. While his general remarks on the Council and the heroic role played by Mark Eugenicus, the Metropolitan of Ephesus, simply repeat common Orthodox rhetoric, the source for the date of the patriarch's death is different. This source can be established. Patriarch Joseph, as Bars'kyj correctly noted, was buried in the church of Santa Maria Novella in Florence, in which the pope lived during the Council, so that Bars'kyj's source, as it is so often the case in this early part of the manuscript, was epigraphic: the subsequently lost inscription on the tomb of the patriarch. This would suggest that the inscription visible on the patriarch's tomb in the early eighteenth century testified to the fact that he in fact died on 9 June, and not on the following day, as stated in the Latin Acts. This perhaps does not resolve the controversy, but does add a new piece to the jigsaw. It is interesting that by the time that Bars'kyj had arrived in Florence, it was not a physical reality that preoccupied him, but a metaphysical one. His concern was with the struggle of his home Church and its values, which he saw reflected in the one that he encountered every day on his pilgrimage, as a stranger looking in.

When Bars'kyj was returning to Venice, in many ways it was a journey out of a strange, threatening, and alien environment into a familiar one, which he had experienced several months earlier, and where he was no longer the lonely stranger waiting outside the city gates:

> [I] straight away went to the Greek church and attended vespers and saw the priests. I bowed, right down to the ground, before the archpriest who recognized me, and I asked him not to bar me from going to their hospice [despite it being] at such a late hour. He not only granted me my request, but went with me to the hospice (which is not far from the church) and instructed those living there, not to prevent me from staying there as long as I wished to remain in Venice.[53]

Bars'kyj's sojourn at the San Giorgio dei Greci hospice lasted over four and a half months, during which time he was provided with a bed, had access to the Greek school, and was given a small weekly stipend paid every Sunday to him and to Greek refugees from Turkish-occupied lands who had managed to escape to Venice. It was here that he also received moral support and religious companionship. As one could anticipate, there was a certain shift in Bars'kyj's mode of expressing observations, in contrast with the passages that immediately preceded it. Once removed from a position of absolute alienation, Bars'kyj writes from a position of greater security, where he has time to reflect on the whole philosophy of pilgrimage and is able to contemplate the secular past of the surrounding environment. His observations of Venice are crowded with genre details as he describes the festivals, carnivals, and the various curiosities that he encountered in the Piazza di San Marco. He notes the glass factories in Murano; the church of San Marco, which he takes to be an old Orthodox church taken over by the Roman rite; the Ponte di Rialto, which he complains is crowded with over-expensive shops; he catalogues tricks performed by cardplayers, jugglers, and strongmen, all

for the entertainment of people in the Piazza. Parallels may be drawn with other contemporary accounts of Venice, by travelers taking in the sights as part of the Grand Tour.[54]

In three passages, however, Bars'kyj breaks with the conventions of describing Venice as part of the Grand Tour. The first passage is a strange and lengthy defense of pilgrimage; such an expression of self-justification can only be made from a position of relative security, when one is able to externalize a situation after having experienced it. From the security of a safe haven, one can justify one's actions, particularly with an anticipated audience in mind. Bars'kyj composed the last part of his account of his Italian pilgrimage in Venice from notes that he had assembled earlier. He intersperses the text with references to his "patient reader." The emphasis on the pious nature of his text may in fact be seen as an attempt to convert the essentially secular nature of his Venice travel notes into a text with a religious significance. It needs to be read with the knowledge that at the time of writing it, Bars'kyj thought that the pilgrimage was close to an end, and that with spring he would retrace his steps home:

> Many people think, and say, that a pilgrim traveling through the world and passing through many lands, simply does it to collect money. I can speak with a clear conscience and say that only God knows all of the trials and torments of the traveler. Only God knows, how in the summer, under the burning sun, the body is so bent over that it hurts the heart and the head, and how, when you are pouring with sweat, your bones become so weakened that you cannot make the effort to eat, or to drink, or indeed, even to speak. Only God knows how in the autumn time, when you are caught in the rain, in a field or a forest, and you are far away from a town or a village, how it is then to endure the rain and the wind, while shivering, and groaning in your heart, and how sometimes weeping you call upon the Lord, because you do not have a single dry thread on all of your freezing body, and how you are chilled to the bone, wet from the rain, sodden and heavy. Likewise I could relate, how in the winter time, in the cold, in the frost and in the snow, with your inner and outer organs frozen, how you usually manage to endure this, but sometimes you cannot and your life ends prematurely. But if you do continue, it is without a single warm limb, but only with a warm spirit, and it is this that gives you life. Do not think, my dear reader, that if through one thing or another, the traveler meets his death, he will be denied the Kingdom of Heaven. Each traveler, if he is a true traveler, who travels for the sake of Christ, and does not simply travel to gather wealth, traveling the world to see the beauties of this world with the different lands, peoples and customs, but the traveler who goes in fulfillment of a vow, or through a wish or a desire to save himself, and goes to visit the holy sites sanctified by the footsteps of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, or to worship the relics of the holy saints of God, then he and all like him, will live with the angels.[55]

Although on a rather elementary level Bars'kyj can be interpreted as stating his credentials as a bone fide pilgrim, it is also an act of differentiation from a Roman Catholic pilgrim, where Bars'kyj presents a fairly obvious subtext as to whom he considers to be a true pilgrim. The stress on the need for poverty and for traveling on foot can be fairly read in self-referential terms; what is more interesting is when

he goes on to denounce Catholic pilgrims, whom he observes at each holy site making their confessions and receiving communion. He exclaims, "Who can honestly say his confession so frequently?" Then he answers his own question in the negative and says that those travelers will "meet with an evil death."[56] Bars'kyj was certainly aware of the differing traditions of receiving communion in the East and the West: in his own tradition it was usual to say confession twice annually, once before Easter and once before Christmas, by contrast with the Latin tradition of almost weekly communion. In his definitions of what constitutes a true pilgrim traveling towards his heavenly goal, he arrives at the answer that in the final analysis, he needs to be an Orthodox Christian; otherwise, his reward will be eternal damnation.

The second passage consists of a description of a carnival held in Venice at Shrovetide. Again, I severely abridge Bars'kyj's rich, flowing rhetoric. First he describes the various dances, games, and fireworks in the Piazza di San Marco, then the portable theater erected in the square and the public slaughter of four oxen for the feast:

> ...two or three days later, within the doge's palace, they arranged stalls to seat people and a multitude of people gathered. They led out an ox, with a rope around its horns, and took it away a certain distance, where it was set upon by dogs, specially trained for the purpose, which gnawed off its ears while the animal was still alive. And so they tortured to death a second, a third and a fourth one, doing the same to each up to the tenth ox. The tenth they released without a rope; the eleventh they strung up by a rope in the middle of the doge's courtyard, and with the twelfth they simply chopped its head off. When I saw this and saw how much the people were entertained by this, I was almost in tears. How can any charitable person witness the torture of a kind animal, which was forced to endure such great torment, and to have heard its terrified cries and its roars of agony, without having his heart pierced? I remember, how I, the sinful one, said to myself at the time, Surely this animal is worthy of great honor, for was it not an ox that was chosen to wait on the newly born Lord, Jesus Christ, in His manger? It was only the ox and the domestic ass.... Rather than thanking the Lord, we torture it and prefer a nasty cunning dog to the worthy kind ox. What I say is that we need to love, rather than torture those who love us. Yet they have closed minds, and they kiss, sit, eat and drink together, but hate the sight of the beggar and cast him away from their eyes. O madness of mankind! O madness of men who do such silly and evil things.[57]

If in the first passage Bars'kyj was drawing a line of demarcation between a true pilgrim and a Catholic one, here the target is the host society within which he finds himself. There is a conscious identification of the tortured oxen with the Orthodox traveler. The madness that Bars'kyj describes is one which the outside observer sees in the foreign society through which he moves.[58]

By contrast, when Pëtr Tolstoj was resident in Venice in his "large house, with many rooms built of fine stone," he attended the carnival and noted how many Venetians were amused by seeing "great bulls baited with mastiffs." Later, he continues,

> in front of the Venetian prince they held three enormous bulls which they decapitated with swords. They severed the head of one bull with a single stroke of the sword, so cleanly and swiftly, that its point sank into the ground, and this two men did very quickly to the heads of two of the bulls. While the third man could not sever the head of the third bull with a single stroke.[59]

Tolstoj makes no moral judgement, nor does he attribute a religious significance. As a tourist and observer, he records what he sees and passes on to describe the other entertainments.

The third passage is the longest of the three, and for the material which it contains is one of the most important in the first section of the manuscript. Bars'kyj gave it the title "A description of the church of Saint George which is in Venice." Despite this, there is little in it that would interest the architectural historian or the archeologist. The physical description of the church runs for exactly two lines, but what follows is a most detailed analysis of the liturgical life of the Greek community in Venice. Bars'kyj prefaces the section with the words, "In liturgical celebrations, everything corresponds to our service, except for the following details."[60] What he then presents is several pages of the most detailed observations on how the celebration of the Divine Liturgy differs from that celebrated in Kiev. The detail includes every aspect of the liturgy, such as what words are said by whom and from what exact physical position in the church.[61] For example, Bars'kyj observes that "the *prokeimenon* is not sung before the reading of the Epistle, but nevertheless the Epistle is read. After the reading of the Epistle, the two choirs do not sing the Alleluia, but only one from one side of the church."[62] And so the details continue for all aspects of the liturgical celebrations that Bars'kyj witnessed in the Greek church during the winter that he spent in Venice, now armed with the knowledge of the Greek language. Not only does it appear to be the most detailed account of the peculiarities of eighteenth-century Greek Orthodox practice in Venice, but it is also an invaluable source for the reconstruction of early eighteenth-century Ukrainian liturgical practices in Kiev. Bars'kyj worked from the premise that the most correct liturgical practices were those of his own Church, and his purpose was to note deviations from them. By carefully examining these deviations, the Ukrainian peculiarities are also revealed. For example, one passage refers to the forty days of Lent:

> During the forty-day Lent, at the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts the readings from the Holy Scriptures are not done from the center of the church, but from the bema, and the "Glory to Thee" is sung by an assistant priest[63] at the altar. This is unlike the way it is in our church, where the reading is done from the center of the church and it is here that the "Glory to Thee" is also sung... On Fridays during Lent they do not read the *Pasija,* but only a little from the Gospels, and instead of the *Pasija,* they read parts from the *Akathistos* to the Most Holy Mother of God, divided into sections of three stanzas each, one for each Friday.[64]

Of course the *Pasija*, which for Bars'kyj was the norm, was a Ukrainian peculiarity unknown not only to the Greeks, but also to the other Orthodox peoples. This liturgical celebration was established in the first half of the seventeenth century under the Kievan metropolitan Peter Mohyla, for the first four Fridays of Great Lent, when in the evenings, selections were read from the account of the Passion in the four Gospels, accompanied by certain hymns. It was described in the *Cvetnaja Triod'*[65] published in 1702. Bars'kyj's account of 1724 fills in some of the missing details. In this section Bars'kyj establishes a methodology to which he returns in the final section of the manuscript, dealing with the monasteries of Mount Athos, where he presents an exceptionally detailed account of the liturgical celebrations at the Great Lavra Monastery. For all the monasteries he subsequently visited, Bars'kyj returned to this paradigm, noting how the celebrations compared with or differed from this one. By that stage, however, his goals had changed. Now he was looking to the liturgies on Athos, which he thought preserved the liturgy of primitive Christianity to the greatest extent, and through which he wished to reform the liturgical practices of his homeland.[66]

Venice was an important watershed in Bars'kyj's Italian pilgrimage, at which he could bring together and distill the experiences of his first year on the road. This paper has been an attempt to map out Bars'kyj's progress in his physical pilgrimage as well as to note changes and developments in the traveler and his journal. When, after he had made his final preparations to return home, it appeared to Bars'kyj that God had intervened and told him to travel to the Greek islands, "I was overjoyed and thanked my Creator for His benediction and providence, for me, his sinful slave, as I realized that I was not acting according to my will, but that He was doing with me according to His holy will."[67]

Australian National University

NOTES

1. The manuscript bears a title by a later hand, probably that of P. M. Stroev, Странствованія монаха Василія Григоровича. Рукопись своеручная автора. (Travels of the monk Vasylij Hryhorovyč. Author's autograph manuscript.) Since 8 September 1931, it has been in the collection of the Akademija nauk Ukraïny in Kiev, where it is housed in the Central'na naukova biblioteka, Viddil rukopysiv as codex V, 1062. In 1991 the autograph of Bars'kyj's *Stranstvovanija* was brought by courier from Kiev to the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University for conservation work at the North-East Document Conservation Center, and for preparation for publication in the *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature* series. It was only after the conservation work had been carried out and it was possible to examine in detail Bars'kyj's impressive 503 folia manuscript, that it became possible to appreciate the full extent of Bars'kyj's contribution to several areas of scholarship.

2. The facsimile of Bars'kyj's autograph will appear as a volume in the *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*, Texts series. The first of the two volumes of translation and commentary has now been completed and will be published as part of the English Translations series. This will be the first facsimile publication of Bars'kyj's text, which prior to the conservation of the manuscript was

illegible in places. Furthermore, the texts will include a lengthy and comprehensive account of Bars'kyj's life and activities, the first such study for over a century. For a summary of the earlier literature see Nikolaj Bursakov, *Странствованія Василія Григоровича-Барскаго по святымъ мѣстамъ Востока съ 1723 по 1747 г.*, Православное Палестинское общество, 4 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1885–87).

3. Parts of Bars'kyj's account of Bari have been translated into Italian. See Gerardo Cioffari, *Viaggiatori russi in Puglia dal '600 al primo* '900, Biblioteca della Ricerca: Puglia Europea, vol. 7 (Fasano, 1990), 75–115.

4. On Russian pilgrimage literature and Bars'kyj's place in it, see Theofanis G. Stavrou and Peter R. Weisensel, *Russian Travelers to the Christian East from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century* (Columbus, Ohio, 1986); Klaus-Dieter Seeman, *Die altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur. Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Genres* (Munich, 1976); Gail Diane Lenhoff Vroon, *The Making of the Medieval Russian Journey,* Ph.D dissertation, University of Michigan, 1978.

5. A parallel may be drawn with Bars'kyj's earlier Russian contemporary, Pëtr Tolstoj, who was sent by Tsar Peter in 1697 to Venice for two years to study naval science. Tolstoj was accompanied by servants and while remaining true to the Orthodox faith, left a factually accurate account of Italy and its churches. See Max J. Okenfuss, *The Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi: A Muscovite in Early Modern Europe* (DeKalb, Ill., 1987).

6. He writes,"The most beautiful and foremost church of the city is dedicated to the Holy Apostle, the Evangelist Saint Mark, which has been converted into a Roman Catholic church." Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 77a. All references to the Bars'kyj text are to the autograph manuscript as reproduced in the facsimile volume.

7. The name Vasyl' Hryhorovyč Bars'kyj has given rise to some controversy and the various changes and alterations to the name are discussed comprehensively in the introduction to the facsimile volume.

8. The controversial question of Bars'kyj's relationship with Feofan Prokopovyč I discuss in some detail in the introduction to the facsimile volume, and on the basis of chronology conclude that when Prokopovyč was teaching at the Academy, Bars'kyj would have been doing elementary Latin and struggling with Alvarez's *Institutiones lingue Latinae,* rather than listening to lectures in Latin on philosophy.

9. It was not unusual for Kievans to study at Jesuit colleges in the Polish lands. Feofan Prokopovyč, Stefan Javors'kyj, and Metropolitan Jasyns'kyj can all be cited as examples. It was also usual for the Kievans to take vows as Roman Catholics and become Uniates for the duration of their studies and to revert to Orthodoxy on their return to Kiev. The three churchmen cited above all did this. Bars'kyj and his companion took the more unusual step of not taking Roman Catholic vows, but pretended to be Catholics from the Polish Commonwealth. Throughout his travels, Bars'kyj refused to compromise his faith.

10. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 4.

11. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 4.

12. Speech in honor of Tsar Peter I's return from abroad, delivered on 23 October 1717. Text in I. P. Eremin, ed., *Феофан Прокопович. Сочинения* (Moscow: Akademija nauk, 1961), 65; translated in James Cracraft, "Feofan Prokopovich," in J. G. Garrard, ed., *The Eighteenth Century in Russia* (Oxford, 1973), 91.

13. S. P. Rozanov, "Путешествіе Іеромонаха Ипполита Вишенскаго въ Іерусалимъ, на Синай и Афонъ," in *Православный Палестинскій сборникъ,* vol. 61 (1914).

14. Archimandrite Leonid, ed., "Паломники-писатели петровскаго и послѣпетровскаго времени," in *Чтенія в Императорском Обществѣ исторіи и древностей россійскихъ,* vol. 86, bk. 3, July-September 1873 (1874), 1–129.

15. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 12.

16. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 5.

17. M. Murjanoff, "Zur Geschichte der Verehrung des heiligen Nikolaus," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 10 (1967): 171–75, and Gerardo Cioffari, *S. Nicola: Leggende e cronache russe*, Centro studi nicolaiani della Basilica di S. Nicola (Bari, 1986).

18. Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (London, 1967), 44–45.

19. Charles W. Jones, *Saint Nicholas of Myra, Bari, and Manhattan: Biography of a Legend* (Chicago, 1978), 155–206.

20. For a collection of these phials see Giovanni Dotoli and Fulvia Fiorino, *Storia e leggenda della Basilica di San Nicola a Bari* (Bari, 1987), 163–85.

21. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 39.

22. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fols. 40–41.

23. On pilgrims to Bari and their accounts see L. Sada and A. Papa, *L'hospitium Sancti Nicolai di Bari* (Bari, 1988) and E. Papagna and S. Russo, "Mercanti e pellegrini all'ombra della basilica," in Francesco Tateo, ed., *Storia di Bari,* vol. 1 (Bari, 1991), 219–50.

24. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fols. 43–44.

25. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 44.

26. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 44.

27. Dmitrij Tolstoj, ed., "Путевой дневникъ П. А. Толстаго," in *Русскій архивъ,* 1888, no. 5:20; English translation Max J. Okenfuss, *The Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi: A Muscovite in Early Modern Europe* (DeKalb, Ill., 1987), 181.

28. Earlier passages are frequently presented in the form of a dialogue with his traveling companion, for example, when he debates with him the need for a pilgrimage, the authenticity of the holy manna, and which road to take next. Constantly he writes, we saw this and we thought that. The travel journal from Bari to Rome and on to Venice is written in the singular.

29. Leed, *Mind of the Traveler,* 45. So wrote Eric Leed in reference to the travel notes of the German clergyman Karl Moritz, Bars'kyj's contemporary, who decided unwittingly to travel throughout England on foot and found himself locked out of inns and treated as an undesirable. This twin feature of the outsider looking in and trying to make sense of what he sees, and the perception that the home culture, and in this instance religious tradition, is something unified and definable, strongly comes to the fore in the latter part of Bars'kyj's Italian journey. Cf. Mary Campbell's notion that "For the actual traveler in truly alien territory the drama of alienation is palpably renewed..." Mary B. Campbell, "'The Object of One's Gaze': Landscape, Writing, and Early Medieval Pilgrimage," in S. D. Westrem, ed., *Discovering New Worlds: Essays on Medieval Exploration and Imagination* (New York, 1991), 5.

30. Bars'kyj was clearly overwhelmed by his impressions of Rome and noted, "It is necessary to speak at length about the great city of Rome... Although I am feeble-minded and have spent too few days in it and have seen too little..." Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 61. His more sophisticated contemporary Bishop Burnet simply notes, "The churches of Rome are so well known, that I will not adventure on any description of them..." *Bishop Burnet's travels through France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland: Describing their religion, learning, government, customs, natural history, trade, etc., and illustrated with curious observations on the buildings, paintings, antiquities, and other curiosities in art and nature* (London, 1750), 216.

31. For a context of other pilgrim accounts of Rome see R. Oursel, *Pellegrini nel Medioevo. Gli uomini, le strade, i santuari* (Milan, 1979); M. Romani, *Pellegrini e viaggiatori nell'economia di Roma dal XIV al XVII secolo* (Milan, 1948), and R. S. Pine-Coffin, *Bibliography of British and American Travel in Italy to 1860* (Florence, 1976).

32. Bars'kyj is playing on the meanings of the word *vitxij*—"ancient" and "dilapidated."

33. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 61.

34. Santa Maria della Rotonda, otherwise known as the Pantheon.

35. The Pantheon was commenced in the first century B.C. and was rebuilt in the second century A.D. by Hadrian.

36. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 65.

37. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 63.

38. See the account in Marien Vasi, *A new picture of Rome and its environs in the form of an itinerary* (London, 1824), 287–88.

39. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 60.

40. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 68. The papal *cavalcata* was abandoned in 1769, when Clement XIV's mount threw him; subsequently, the pope traveled in a special carriage rather than on a white palfrey, as Barskyj describes. See Maurice Andrieux, *Daily Life in Papal Rome in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1968), 36.

41. The intended meaning is that one *baiòcco* is equivalent to four Polish *grosz*es or eight Moscow kopecks.

42. квитка.

43. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 68.

44. Barskyj's slightly earlier Russian contemporary Pëtr Tolstoj, who is fêted by papal representatives in Rome, apart from asides concerning unreliable servants presents quite a conventional description of the city which finds parallels in the writings of other travelers. See Dmitrij Tolstoj, ed., "Путевой дневникъ," *Русскій архивъ*, 1888, no. 7:225–65; Okenfuss, *Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi*, 261–304.

45. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 71.

46. протосингели [πρωτοσύγκελλοι].

47. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 71.

48. In 1700 Tsar Peter I abandoned the old Russian calendar, which was calculated from the date of the Biblical Creation (7208 = 1700), and introduced the Julian calendar with years beginning in January. In the eighteenth century the Julian calendar had fallen eleven days behind the Gregorian one used by most European countries. Barskyj was not particularly at home with the non-Biblical calendar, hence his confusion in subtracting rather than adding the eleven days.

49. Joseph Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and Other Essays* (Oxford, 1964), 26ff.

50. Ivan N. Ostroumoff, *The History of the Council of Florence*, trans. Boris Popoff (Boston, Mass., 1971), 144ff.

51. Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, 31.

52. Ostroumoff, *The History of the Council of Florence*, 148.

53. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 73.

54. A parallel can be drawn with the delightful account by the fabulously rich William Beckford, who in the 1770s noted, "I like this odd town of Venice, and find everyday some new amusement in rambling its innumerable canals and alleys." Guy Chapman, ed., *The Travel-Diaries of William Beckford of Fonthill*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1928), 99. On the Grand Tour tradition see William E. Mead, *The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Boston, Mass., 1914).

55. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 74.

56. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 75.

57. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fols. 35–36.

58. The actual slaughter of the oxen appears to be related to a ceremony designed to perpetuate the memory of the victory of Doge Vitale Michiel II in 1162 over Ulric, Patriarch of Aquileia. The latter had been imprisoned, and was eventually freed on the condition that he would annually slaughter oxen on the final Thursday of the carnival. See Okenfuss, *Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi*, 155, n. 71.

59. Dmitrij Tolstoj, ed., "Путевой дневникъ," *Русскій архивъ*, 1888, no. 4:547, 548; Okenfuss, *Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi*, 154–55.

60. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 78.

61. Other Petrine travelers, like Barskyj's countryman Ippolit Vyšenskyj and Pëtr Tolstoj, did leave descriptions of the liturgies they witnessed, and made comments on how they differed from those at home, but none did this with anything approaching the detail of Barskyj. See S. P. Rozanov, ed., "Путешествіе Іеромонаха Ипполита Вишенскаго въ Іерусалимъ," *Православный Палестинскій сборникъ*, vol. 61 (St. Petersburg, 1914); Dmitrij Tolstoj, ed., "Путевой дневникъ," *Русскій архивъ*, 1888, no. 3:344–49; Okenfuss, *Travel Diary of Peter Tolstoi*, 78–85.

62. Barskyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fol. 78.

63. седмичній.

64. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija*, fols. 78–79.

65. *Цвѣтная тріодь* (Moscow, 1591).

66. Bars'kyj's most significant Slav predecessor in recording liturgical practices was Arsenij Suxanov, sent by Patriarch Nikon in 1649 to study Eastern Christian rites, who left a most detailed description of what he had observed. With the dismissal of Nikon in 1658 and Suxanov's own death ca. 1663, his account remained largely unknown until it was widely circulated in the 1720s, precisely during Bars'kyj's formative years in Kiev. See N. I. Ivanovšyj, ed., "Проскинитарій Арсенія Суханова," *Православный Палестинскій сборникъ*, vol. 3, no. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1889).

67. Bars'kyj, *Stranstvovanija,* fol. 82.

Archeography in the Service of Imperial Policy: The Foundation of the Kiev Archeographic Commission and the Kiev Central Archive of Early Record Books*

PATRICIA KENNEDY GRIMSTED

With the collapse of the Soviet Empire and the unleashing of strong and divergent nationalist movements that had been bitterly suppressed under Soviet communism, intellectuals in successor states are beginning to analyze the imperial ideas of Soviet communism and the national traditions that were long repressed under its aegis. Now with Ukrainian independence, Ukrainian intellectuals are attempting to come to terms with the Ukrainian past in a more open analytic and scholarly vein. Historians are now able to consider long-forbidden critical interpretations, including émigré and other Western analyses of Russian and Soviet imperial policies and national history that were prepared under strongly contrasting intellectual traditions. The history of archeography and archival policies in the Russian Empire likewise deserve critical intellectual analysis. While archives are themselves a product of state functions, and records they hold result from the implementation of state policies, state policies towards archives in different periods reflect the ideology of the regime that created them and the political aims of the regime they serve.

As we honor the one hundred fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Archeographic Commission in Kiev, we may be tempted to look back to its beginnings with nostalgia and to view its thrice golden anniversary as an historical precedent to the impressive work being undertaken today by the revived Ukrainian Archeographic Commission and the Institute of Ukrainian Archeography recently founded on its basis. Already the present anniversary has produced an important monograph by O. I. Zhurba on the history of the Archeographic Commission during its first seventy-eight years, which surveys its fundamental contribution to documentary publishing in the Ukrainian lands and at the same time recognizes some of its intellectual heritage and the political traditions in which it functioned.[1] Other Institute publications honoring the anniversary attest to the publication zeal and attainments of the new institute, while papers presented at the conference reveal the new enthusiasm for dispassionate, critical analysis of sources for Ukrainian history and the work of those historians and archivists who have in the past contributed so much to the Ukrainian archeographic and more broadly historical traditions.

* The present essay is revised from a paper presented at the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute in February 1988. A Ukrainian version was prepared for the Conference Honoring the 150th Anniversary of the Founding of the Archeographic Commission, at Kiev/Sedniv, 19–20 October 1993.

I would like to take a somewhat broader view and reflect on the political and ideological context of the foundation of the Archeographic Commission in 1843 and the closely related founding of the Kiev Archive of Early Record Books nine years later, in terms of Russian imperial policies of the early nineteenth century. It behooves us today to look beyond the Ukrainian borders and view these developments in the comparative context of the Western regions of the Russian Empire and the eastern regions of the Habsburg Empire that then encompassed the Western Ukrainian lands. Today it is possible and appropriate to re-analyze the archeographic work of the nineteenth-century commissions and the related historical archives in light of a broader understanding of Russian and Austrian imperial policies operative in the period of their creation. By examining the ideological and political aims of the empires in founding and developing those archives, it will be possible to put archeographic efforts in Ukraine in their historiographic context in terms of the national, political, and social pressures facing imperial policies of the first half of the nineteenth century.

One of the most penetrating intellectual analyses of the ideology of the reign of Nicholas I was written in the 1950s by Nicholas Riasanovsky.[2] Riasanovsky's analysis of the tripartite state ideology, "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality" (*pravoslavie, samoderzhavie, narodnost'*), formulated most forcefully by the Minister of Education under Nicholas I, Count Sergei Semenovich Uvarov (1786–1855), provides an important intellectual framework and a depth of understanding of the ideological principles that guided the autocratic Russian emperor of the period. Although Riasanovsky does not mention archives and archeography as reflecting state ideology, it is nevertheless worth considering them in that context. Zhurba's recent historical essay on the Archeographic Commission in Kiev takes into account the ideological background of Official Nationality, but the author did not have access to the Riasanovsky study. While Uvarov's name does not figure in Zhurba's account, it should be noted that many of the commission members were closely tied to St. Vladimir University in Kiev, and that the Kiev Archive for Early Record Books throughout the prerevolutionary period operated as a division of the university library under the firm tutelage of the Ministry of Education (Enlightenment). The ideas of Official Nationality provided essential underpinning for the Great Russian imperial component in state policies of the period, to the detriment of other Slavic nationalities within the Russian Empire. That imperial tradition is readily apparent in the development of archives and archeographic efforts in the Western gubernias in the early nineteenth century. For example, the 1840 proposal for the establishment of the Kiev commission, while demonstrating the important archeographic work to be performed by it, includes a revealing justification for its foundation:

> Recognizing the necessity of preservation of Russian antiquities in the Western gubernias, as the obvious proof of the right of the Empire to proprietorship of these lands,

from time immemorial belonging to the family of Saint Vladimir, Your Esteemed Excellency ordered the clear direction which must comply with the execution of this plan.[3]

The archeographic commission that was established in Kiev in 1843 did not bear the name "Archeographic Commission," as did the Imperial Archeographic Commission established in St. Petersburg in 1834, although it was frequently referred to by that name. Nor did it have the broad scholarly aims of the present Archeographic Commission of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, reestablished in Kiev in 1987. The official name of the Temporary Commission for the Analysis of Early Acts in Archives Found in Localities and Monasteries of Kiev, Podolia, and Volhynia Gubernias (*Vremennaia komissiia dlia razbora drevnikh aktov v arkhivakh prisutstvennykh mest i monastyrei Kievskoi, Podol'skoi i Volynskoi gubernii*) suggests the narrower archeographic purpose of its foundation. Its political aim in imperial eyes was as an offshoot of the ultimate imperial purpose of collecting documents that would provide justification for the "return" and integration into the Russian Empire of the lands recently annexed in the course of the Partitions of Poland.

Similarly, the first official historical archive to be founded in the Ukrainian lands under the Russian Empire was established by imperial ukaz in Kiev in 1852 as the Kiev Central Archive for Record Books of Kiev, Volhynia, and Podolia Gubernias *(Kievskii tsentral'nyi arkhiv dlia aktovykh knig gubernii Kievskoi, Volynskoi i Podol'skoi)*.[4] Its major purpose was to house and preserve pre-nineteenth-century court record books from Right Bank Ukraine, the so-called South-West Region (*Iugo-Zapadnyi krai*) of the Russian Empire—the euphemism used in the nineteenth century for those Ukrainian lands. Most of these territories were annexed to the Russian Empire in the course of the Partitions of 1793 and 1795, although the city of Kiev and its immediately surrounding territory on the Right Bank had effectively ceased to be ruled by Poland after the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising in the mid-seventeenth century. The foundation of the archive in Kiev was part of a much larger effort on the part of the Russian authorities to collect and control documentation from all the Western gubernias. Similar historical archives were established simultaneously by the same ukaz in Vilnius for the North-West Region and in Vitsebsk for the so-called Western gubernias to consolidate pre-partition records from their respective territories. My earlier discussion of the establishment of the larger archive in Vilnius and the smaller one in Vitsebsk—and the archeographic commissions that worked with them—suggests their political context.[5] The recent analysis of Belorussian historiography by Dmitrii Karev further develops this interpretation:

> The Vilnius Archeographic Commission was founded for the historico-documentary elucidation of the Orthodox and "elementary root Russian" nature of the region, which in the nineteenth century was "spoiled" by the Poles. The commission was obliged "through history" to promote the return to its original and pure "Russian character."[6]

Although many of those involved in the foundation and development of these institutions were leading scholars of the period, the imperial purposes for founding these archives and the related archeographic commissions were hardly scholarly. Nor were they founded principally for the purpose of archival or historical preservation. The overriding political purposes involved, which strongly affected their orientation and functions, need to be understood in the historical context of the problems the Russian Empire faced in attempting to integrate the territories which—in the contemporary euphemism—had been "recently reunited to the Empire." Intense problems of social, political, and economic integration came in the wake of the annexation of the vast western borderlands that had been part of the partitioned Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth for three or four centuries.

The Polish or polonized Ruthenian upper classes in these regions, accustomed to many more local rights and privileges, were anxious to preserve their former lands and qualify for Russian gentry rights, such as would exempt them from the military draft and allow appropriate entrance into the imperial Table of Ranks. In Russian imperial eyes in that period, there was to be no distinction between Polish and Ukrainian—or Ruthenian—gentry; all were to be considered of common Russian stock. Under the Polish Commonwealth, entry into the ranks of the *szlachta* had been relatively difficult, but under Russian rule, it was initially fairly easy for Poles to secure gentry rights in the Russian Empire, even with forged documents. As proof of gentry status, Russian authorities required official copies of documents certified by local *uezd* courts. Accordingly, official copies of documents from pre-partition court and municipal records were in great demand to substantiate family lineage and noble status, landholding grants, and other privileges.[7] After the dissolution of the Hetmanate at the end of the eighteenth century, some Cossack officers were also anxious to enter the ranks of the Russian gentry. They, too, often sought false Polish documents.[8] As a result, there was a serious wave of fabrication of documents and attempts at falsification of the original record books and individual documents.

Throughout the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth extensive systematic records had been kept of grants of land and other privileges, and of various court proceedings and other legal actions on the part of the gentry, in much more legally systematized form than was known under other parts of the Russian Empire.[9] Record books themselves were traditionally retained in the building that housed the court or court office. Many of these groups of records in the course of time had fallen on neglect or plunder, and the wars that accompanied the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising in the mid–seventeenth century proved disastrous for many of the earlier records.

The archival fate of pre-partition court and municipal records from the Western Ukrainian lands of the Commonwealth that came under the rule of the Habsburg Empire after the Partitions differed remarkably from that of records from areas that came under the Russian Empire. Within ten years of the first Partition (1772),

Austrian authorities had established a comprehensive archive in L'viv and brought into state archival custody all local court records from the palatinates of Ruthenia and Belz. They hired extensive teams of officials to prepare name and geographic indexes of the record books, resulting in a set of remarkable finding aids that can still be used today.[10]

The story is quite different for records from the Ukrainian lands of the Commonwealth that became part of the Russian Empire. Although the basic organization of the court system and the nature of the records produced in Right Bank Ukraine were quite similar to those in other parts of the Commonwealth, inasmuch as the palatinates of Kiev, Volhynia, and Bratslav had been part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania until 1569, their courts functioned under the provisions of the Lithuanian Statutes of 1529 and 1566. Even after these lands were shifted to Crown jurisdiction by the Union of Lublin in 1569, their courts continued to function according to the slightly divergent Lithuanian provisions.[11] Documents in most of the court record books from the sixteenth and early seventeenth century accordingly were inscribed in the Ruthenian language, which had been the main chancery language throughout the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The terms of annexation of the Union of Lublin (1569) guaranteed the continued use of the Ruthenian language for the local courts in these areas, although increasingly during the seventeenth century Polish became the language of government and administration throughout the Right Bank Ukrainian lands.[12] It is worth noting in this connection that there was— and still is— no word for the Ruthenian language in the Russian language, and in the nineteenth century there was a noted tendency to speak of it as "Russian," although clearly it was far from the chancery language of Muscovy during that period.[13]

After Russian annexation in 1793 and 1795, and earlier in the case of Kiev and its environs, local Russian courts and municipal administrations superseded the pre-partition Polish agencies. Their functions differed considerably. In the course of the early nineteenth century, Russian authorities sought to extinguish earlier distinctive privileges and subject the local population in the western regions to the more autocratic Russian traditions, including serfdom, which had not been known under the Commonwealth. Initially little attention was paid to the earlier records by Russian authorities, and there were no efforts to protect them or bring them into archival custody. Only when they became aware of their potential legal value and their current political importance did they take measures to ensure their preservation and control over their use and disposition.

Pressures for Russification and persecution of Poles—and Polonized Ruthenians— increased following the 1831 Polish uprising. The rights of the Roman Catholic and Uniate Churches, which were widespread in the area and catered to the local population, were withdrawn. Privileges for the Jewish municipal population were also curtailed. The respectable St. Vladimir University, founded in Kiev in 1834, was closed in 1839, its Polish professors were transferred elsewhere, and it later reopened as a strictly Russian institution with

instruction in the Russian language. As Russification and religious discrimination increased, the multiplying numbers of forged documents from local record books attracted imperial attention.[14]

Government authorities decided they needed more complete control over records from the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Hence out of the reactionary political climate in the 1830s came a new concern for the archival heritage of the Commonwealth and efforts to ensure its preservation and description. Commissions in "the Western gubernias that were returned from Poland" were established by imperial ukaz in December 1833 under the Ministry of Justice to verify, describe, and prevent further falsification of local court records as well as parish registers, including a separate commission for the Right Bank Ukrainian gubernias of Kiev, Volhynia, and Podolia.[15] The commission sent out representatives to local courts where the early record books were housed. They were instructed to count and number the folios in the record books, and record their findings at the end. A cord was to be tied through each book and affixed by seal to the binding so that additional pages could not be added. Lists of the books and inventories were to be prepared. Many record books still extant in the Kiev archive (TsDIA-K) have the stamp of the 1833 commission with the appropriate cords and seals.[16] On the whole, however, the commission's work was not successful, and there were many later complaints about the sloppiness and inadequacy of its efforts.[17] New commissions were established in 1842 to complete the examination and inventorying of the record books, and more stringent conditions were prescribed for their work.[18]

As pointed out by specialists both at the time and later, however, the work of the commissions in terms of inventorying the record books themselves proved almost a total failure. The commissions lacked a working office and trained staff. In most cases, the individuals sent out to examine local records were unable to read the various forms of Ruthenian, to say nothing of the Latin, Polish, and in some cases even Armenian languages, in which the documents were recorded, let alone to understand the early judicial terminology involved. It is understandable that in many instances they simply gave up before they started. Indeed, it soon came to light that even when they had not begun the inventorying process, they sometimes filed reports that the work was completed.[19] Descriptive inventories were prepared in a few areas in Ukrainian lands, but according to one recent account, only a few inventories for the gubernia of Podolia were completed.[20] For Kiev gubernia, inventories were completed for four *uezds*—Chyhyryn, Lypovets', Uman', and Skvyra—but these covered court registers only from the post-partition Russian period.[21] Some volumes in TsDIA-K today bear the stamp of the 1842 commission.[22] The basic failure of this commission led to political pressure on the governor-general to remedy the situation with the formation of a proper archive.

The reactionary Russian governor-general in Kiev, D. G. Bibikov, who had been appointed as Nicholas I's strong man to impose Russification on the Ukrainian lands, took a special interest in the problem.[23] Strongly committed to the

suppression of Polish influences, Bibikov played a crucial role in implementing imperial policies in Ukrainian lands, which is shown in the contemporary treatment by the historian and editor of *Kievlianin,* V. Ia. Shul'gin. Shul'gin's account provides a helpful background regarding Bibikov's attitudes and policies in the face of the social, religious, and cultural tensions of the period brought about by the bitter repression of the Polish population following the 1831 uprising.[24] Shul'gin does not analyze the work of the commissions in dealing with local record books, but according to other reports, under Bibikov's direction the commission for the South-West Region was the most effective. He himself boasted that there were "some 64,000 *szlachta* to be excluded from the gentry rolls, because they were illegally inscribed."[25] Reference was made elsewhere to the fact that during this period in the three Ukrainian gubernias, 141,708 individuals of Polish origin had used false documents to establish claims to Russian gentry status, many of whom were discovered under Bibikov's investigation.[26] These allegations of documentary forgeries and falsification now need further investigation as to the extent they were part of Bibikov's scheme to disinherit as many gentry of Polish origin as possible.

Simultaneously with the failure of the ill-fated 1842 commission, Bibikov played a major role in the establishment of an archeographic commission in Kiev, modeled on the scholarly Imperial Archeographic Commission established in St. Petersburg in 1834. With the immediate example of a similar archeographic commission established in Vilnius in 1842, Bibikov sought and received imperial sanction for the formation of the Kiev commission. Although its purposes were indeed the location and publication of historical documents from Right Bank Ukraine, the strong nationalist aim of government authorities is everywhere apparent. They conceived of such a commission with the ideological aim of demonstrating the traditional Russian character of these areas and hence promoting the values of the Official Nationality propagated by the Emperor. Bibikov described the potential work of the commission in a letter to the Ministry of Internal Affairs in April 1843, explaining the need to collect documents "which clearly demonstrate the inherent Russian character, which was the most significant phenomenon from earliest times in the South-West Region."[27]

To be sure, in the eyes of its academic founders in Kiev the Archeographic Commission also had serious scholarly purposes. Like the nationality elements in Uvarov's policy of "Official Nationality," it was in a wider context a product of the general increased interest in history and antiquities throughout the Russian Empire in the period, and in a broader political and intellectual context, a reflection of early nineteenth-century European romanticism. The aims of most of the intellectual leaders of the commission were in fact basically scholarly and historical, and certainly the instigating circle of interested intellectuals in Kiev was strongly committed to serious archeographic work and historical investigation. This circle included M. O. Maksymovych, rector of the university in Kiev;[28] N. D. Ivanishev (M. D. Ivanyshev), dean of the law faculty and later rector of the

university;[29] Father Innokentii (I. A. Borisov), rector of the Kiev Theological Academy;[30] and the history professor V. F. Dombrovskii (Dombrovs'kyi).[31]

More than the others, Governor-General Bibikov saw the political potentialities of the Kiev commission and sought to use it for imperial ends. Further serious study of Bibikov, his intellectual outlook, and his role and personal aims in the establishment of the commission, is needed. There is little doubt that he viewed the commission as his own political tool rather than an independent learned society. In organizing the commission, Bibikov relied heavily on his strong supporter Baron Stanislav de Chodoire (Shoduar), who was active in Kiev intellectual circles,[32] and on his chancery director, M. E. Pisarev.[33] He conceived of the commission as a learned government body directly subordinate to the administration of his own office, as was clear in its first meeting (8 December 1843). Pisarev was appointed as first president of the commission (1843–1848), and Chodoire as vice-president. Pisarev, however, submitted a letter refusing the presidency for reasons of health, and hence the commission was actually without a president for its first two years, leaving Bibikov himself in charge.[34] Pisarev assumed the role from 1845 until 1848. Again, further analysis is needed of these individuals and their immediate roles and purposes in the operation.[24] Ivanishev, who succeeded Chodoire as vice-president of the commission in 1859, was particularly active in drafting and implementing its publication program, and from the beginning assumed a major editorial role. He was one of the first to see the publication potential in the pre-nineteenth-century court record books, but given his position at the university in Kiev, he necessarily subordinated his earlier scholarly interests to those with Russian nationalist overtones that would coincide with official policy, as exemplified by the Russifying intentions of Bibikov. One of his reports at the time was later quoted as follows:

> The main purpose of the Kiev Commission for the Analysis of Early Acts in the present time consists of following the path of historical research, to encourage the return to Russian nationality in South-West Russia and Lithuania, which has been weakened by Catholic propaganda and Polish patriotism.[35]

As a recent study of Ivanishev shows, in the early years of his academic career he had considerable interest in work with West Slavic sources. But as he is quoted as saying in a letter to a colleague in 1840, after he had received his appointment to the university *kafedra* in Kiev he considered it necessary to devote himself first of all to the preparation for publication "of documents of early Russian law that demonstrate a common Slavic system of law from earliest times."[36] Ivanishev complied with official policy to devote his efforts to show the traditional Russian roots of the gentry as well as the peasantry in Right Bank Ukraine, which would serve to reinforce the anti-Polish orientation of Russian authorities in the period. One of the first juridical texts (1557) from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to be prepared under his direction was recommended by Baron de Chodoire, and its

publication justified, because it demonstrated the extent to which the landholding strata in Lithuania "always remained more faithful than others to its basic pure Russian nationality." Hence, such a text could further "demonstrate and contribute to the history of early Russian legal practices."[37]

Once the Archeographic Commission was in place, further pressures for the formation of an archive for the Right Bank Ukrainian gubernias came from members of the commission as well. Their appeals, coinciding with the failure of the work of the 1842 local commissions, helped to convince Bibikov of the need for an archive. Although members of the Kiev Archeographic Commission were from the first strongly committed to the foundation of an archive in Kiev, it was not until the end of 1849 and early 1850 that Bibikov was able to act decisively and pursue the plan in St. Petersburg. The revolutionary events of 1848 in Europe and the fear of further revolt in Ukraine made Nicholas and his conservative officials in St. Petersburg more anxious than ever for tightened polices, safeguards, and repressive measures in "Little Russia." In Kiev, Ivanishev was especially active in getting the archive started and preparing the necessary proposals and reports for Bibikov.[38] Bibikov pursued the plan actively in St. Petersburg, and even sent the Minister of Justice—who initially did not support the plan—a sample of a dilapidated record book from the Kremenets' court as evidence of the destruction of records with improper storage. Simultaneously, reports came in regarding the failure of the 1842 commissions in both the western gubernias and the North-West Region, corroborating Bibikov's arguments. Nicholas I finally concurred with Bibikov's proposal and ordered plans to establish three archives simultaneously in Kiev, Vilnius, and Vitsebsk.[39] Bibikov may well have also been using the episode to promote his own career in the imperial capital; his Russification efforts in Ukraine were well rewarded when he became Minister of Internal Affairs in 1852.

The work of the commission and the archive declined in the period after Bibikov's departure. After its establishment in 1852, the Kiev Central Archive was housed in the library of St. Vladimir University in Kiev, under the direction of the university librarian, and was legally and administratively part of the university. Its first director was university librarian A. Ia. Krasovskii.[40] The archive was in fact run by two assistants, only one with a permanent appointment.[41] Although its resources were severely limited, the archive grew rapidly. During its first few years, it accessioned close to six thousand record books and half a million separate individual documents. The record books accessioned by 1861 (through number 5,838) were all listed in a preliminary inventory compiled by the current archivist E. V. Stankevich, and published serially from 1862 to 1864.[42] Only a few scattered record books were added later (before the revolution), and their numbers added to the master copy of the Stankevich inventory by the later archivist, I. M. Kamanin.[43]

The arrangement of record books within the archive bore little relation to the distinctive institutions of the Polish period which created them or the several

different distinct types of record books involved. The record books collected in the Kiev archive were simply numbered consecutively, and only roughly grouped together according to the nineteenth-century Russian institution from which they were received. This resulted undoubtedly from the fact that most of the pre-partition courts and magistracies were superseded by local Russian institutions operating in the same physical location; hence, many of the record books had been taken over by, and grouped indiscriminately under the names of, the successor institutions. Whether or not the lack of clear identification was intentional, the lists compiled served to obliterate the names of the original creating institutions from the Polish period. In many cases, records from the successor institution were included without distinction in the same group of records, further blurring the significance of the administrative and judicial changes that occurred under Russian administration. A comprehensive catalogue of the archive in Kiev, similar to the ones prepared for the Vilnius archive, was never prepared.[44]

During the nineteenth century, one of the most important official functions of the Kiev archive, as of those in Vilnius and Vitsebsk, was the preparation of official certified copies of documents from the pre-partition record books. This was particularly important for families of Polish ancestry who were anxious to verify property holding, titles, and other family rights and privileges. In this connection, considerable government attention was focused on the archive and again on the record books it contained after the Polish uprising of 1863, in the course of a renewed intense wave of anti-Polish feelings and efforts towards Russification, especially in Right Bank Ukraine. Continued falsification of documents from the Kiev archive came to the attention of authorities, and a new investigatory commission was established. One of the archivists of Polish background was accused as a ringleader in an extensive falsification scandal. It was suggested that as many as 2,664 copies of documents forged from as many as 777 books had been issued during the first fifteen years of the archive's existence, and an atelier in Zhytomyr was discovered that specialized in falsified documents.[45] Reports with varying statistics on falsification remain among the records of the Heraldry Department of the Senate and from records of local gentry assemblies.[46] Pending completion of the investigation—which continued for the next two decades—Russian authorities refused to review petitions regarding noble status based on documents from the Kiev archive.[47] Verification continued until 1909.[48] Archival developments were dictated by these political and social pressures. There were new cries for better and more thorough description of the early record books and more control to prevent falsification of documents and tampering with the original books.

The ambitious project of complete detailed document-by-document inventories for each court record book grew out of the demands of the investigatory commissions, and the attempt to register all documents inscribed in each book so as to avoid further forgeries or falsification. Within the archive itself, the project was started in the 1860s, according to a plan drawn up by the Greek specialist and

Kiev university professor K. G. Strashkevych.[49] Titles and dates for all the individual documents inscribed in each record book were to be listed with the appropriate folios indicated. Given the archive's resources in staff and expertise, however, the project was ill-conceived and inadequately supported. Inventories for only eighty books were published before 1917. Inventories for an additional eighty-eight books that were prepared but never published are available in the archive.[50]

During the late nineteenth century, documentary publications from the archive were principally the work of the Kiev Archeographic Commission rather than of the archive itself. Documentary editions based on its holdings started even before the archive itself had been established, as part of the program of the commission. The first well known series of commission-sponsored documentary publications started even before the archive itself was established, consisting of four volumes of *Pamiatniki* issued between the years 1845 and 1859.[51] The second, more extensive series of documentary publications started after the archive was established and continued until the First World War.[52] A systematic plan for the series worked out by Ivanishev in 1858 continued to guide the commission's publication program.[53] Many of those involved in these documentary publications also helped with the inventories of the books themselves, as evidenced from the listed compilers. The two publication series differed in their plans, but both were based on the principle of selective editions of archival documents on specific, rather narrowly defined topics, rather than the more systematic publication of different groups of documents in the archive. In this sense, the publication programs differed radically from the corresponding publications of pre-partition Polish documentation from Western Ukraine published on the basis of record books in the L'viv archive for early record books.[54]

Considerable controversy surrounded the documentary publication program of the Kiev archive, and Polish scholars were quick to criticize its strong anti-Polish orientation. Indeed, from the outset Ivanishev, who had drawn up the plans for the series, was seen as catering to the Russifying tendencies of the imperial authorities by trying to use the archival publication program to show the strong Russian heritage of the nobility as well as the peasantry of Right Bank Ukrainian lands. Ivanishev's critics elicited his most vociferous response in 1876, when he replied to Polonophile critics regarding the choice of documents and subjects for the publication series.[55] Controversy was so intense that the later archive director Romanovs'kyi found evidence to suggest that one of the objectives of the insurgents in 1863 had been the destruction of the archive and the murder of Ivanishev.[56]

The extent to which the foundation and early work of the Kiev Archeographic Commission and archive were motivated by political purposes did not go unnoticed before the revolution. In the late 1870s, when it was possible to discuss such matters in print, the insightful article by Shul'gin cited above about imperial

Russification policies in the "South-West Region" under Governor-General Bibikov concluded with a biting commentary about Bibikov's purposes and aims:

> Science was obliged to serve the interests of the administration; operations followed and bore a purely political character, that is why purely learned establishments were established with a political goal. Such indeed was the idea behind the founding of first the Temporary Commission for the Analysis of Early Acts... and second, behind the founding of the Central Archive for the Preservation of Record Books of the three gubernias (1851).... The Archeographic Commission and the Central Archive gave the people of science strong tools for the protection of scientific-historical truth from infringement and distortion by careless publicists.[57]

A full study of the political orientation and aims involved, and the extent to which these affected the methods and products of the prerevolutionary commission and archive, is still needed. In 1893, when the Commission for the Analysis of Early Acts celebrated its fiftieth anniversary, the anniversary volume about its activities devoted considerable attention to the work of the archive with which the commission was closely involved, but there was little coverage of the political aims or analysis of the methods and choice of documentation in that light.[58] A survey of the work of the Kiev commission and a bibliography of all its publications were issued before the revolution in an important two-volume edition of articles and reports devoted to the commission, but there are no suggestions about the political controversies associated with the series.[59] Under Russian and Soviet imperial restrictions during many periods, historiographical analysis of an open and scholarly nature was discouraged. Now that scholarship is freed from such restrictions, these publications and the allegations regarding the compilers need more rigorous analysis in light of Russian imperial and nationality policies. Eventually it will be worth continuing the analysis into the post-revolutionary period when, after the brief period of Ukrainization in the 1920s, imperial Soviet policies under Stalin curtailed the scholarly functions of the archive in the 1930s.

In contrast to the Russian imperial policies that led to the founding of the archive in the mid-nineteenth century, it is also worth reflecting on the Nazi imperial policies that so tragically affected the subsequent fate of the Kiev Archive of Early Acts during World War II. Russian policy during the reign of Nicholas I motivated collecting the early court and municipal record books together to control their contents and publish documents demonstrating a venerable Russian presence and rights to the lands of the Western gubernias of the empire that had been annexed in the course of the Partitions of Poland by Catherine II. Under the Third Reich, Nazi historians and archivists sought to preserve and utilize the archive's contents to establish German claims to the area. In the framework of Nazi ideology, the most important documents they found were the grants of municipal privileges and municipal record books under the system of Magdeburg Law, which had been received by many cities and towns under the Polish-

Lithuanian Commonwealth. In the warped Nazi view, such documents provided evidence of long-term German influence in Ukrainian lands and would justify the Reich's *Drang nach Osten*. They sought first to preserve the early record books of the Kiev Archive of Early Acts, so that these documents would not be lost in the course of wartime hostilities. Then in September and October of 1943, when the tide of battle turned against the invaders, German archivists evacuated the earliest, and to them the most valuable, charters and record books. They first took approximately half of the archive to Kam'ianets' Podil's'kyi. After a year there, when further retreat became imperative, they chose again the more valuable half of their loot for shipment west to their archival center in Czechoslovakia. Almost all of the record books evacuated by the Nazis were recovered at the end of the war—part by Soviet and part by American authorities—and returned to Kiev. The two-thirds of the record books that the Nazis had left behind for want of transportation facilities perished during the liberation of Kiev. The details of that story and the fate of the archive during the war will soon be the subject of another report.[60]

It is an ironic turn of fate, however, that once again the attempt to preserve the early court record books for imperial purposes in fact saved the earliest record books from the Kiev archive. As a welcome tribute to the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Kiev Central Archive of Early Record Books, it is to be hoped that the present Archeographic Commission and Institute of Ukrainian Archeography will consider the preparation of a much needed professional description of the record books collected by the nineteenth-century Commission and Archive but never properly described in print.[61] In addition to serving as an appropriate catalogue of these important historical sources, and providing a history of their fate, such a compilation might help to identify and locate those that might still be held outside the archive.

Harvard University

NOTES

1. O. I. Zhurba, *Kyïvs'ka arkheohrafichna komisiia 1843–1921. Narys istoriï i diial'nosti* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1993). Zhurba's study agrees with many of my conclusions and provides further documentation for some of the interpretations I had discussed earlier.

2. Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959).

3. See the full text as the first appended document in Zhurba's monograph, *Kyïvs'ka arkheohrafichna komisiia*, p. 132.

4. The text of the imperial ukaz of 2 April 1852 is found in *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* (hereafter *PSZ*), series 2, vol. 27, pt. 1, pp. 228–30 (no. 26126), and is reprinted in *Sbornik materialov, otnosiashchikhsia do arkhivnoi chasti v Rossii*, 2 vols. (Petrograd, 1916–17), 1:120–22.

5. See *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981), especially 298–302, 372–77, 457–61, and 520–22, with considerable references to appropriate literature. See also the discussion by N. N. Ulashchik, *Ocherki po arkheografii i istochnikovedeniiu istorii Belorussii feodal'nogo perioda* (Moscow: Nauka, 1973), especially 64–147. Regarding falsification in that area, see also N. N. Ulashchik, *Predposylki krest'ianskoi reformy 1861 g. v Litve i Zapadnoi Belorussii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 91–99.

6. Dmitrii Karev, "Beloruskaia istoriografiia epokhi kapitalizma (1861–1917)," in *Nash radavod*, Book 3: *Materialy mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii po regional'noi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy "Kul'tura narodov Velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo i Belorussii, XIII–nach. XX vv.," Grodno 1991,* part 1 (Hrodna [Grodno], 1991), 61.

7. The process is discussed by A. I. Levitskii [O. I. Levyts'kyi], "Istoriia uchrezhdeniia Kievskogo tsentral'nogo arkhiva," *Chteniia v Istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora-letopistsa* 17 (1903), sec. 2, pt. 1, pp. 16–18. See also A. A. Vvedenskii (A. O. Vvedens'kyi), "Poddelka i fal'sifikatsiia istoricheskikh dokumentov na Ukraine i v Belorussii v XVI–XIX vv.," in *Lektsii po dokumental'nomy istochnikovedeniiu istorii SSSR (Diplomatika)* (Kiev: Izd-vo Kievskogo universiteta, 1963), 129–33. An earlier version of Vvedens'kyi's study was published in Ukrainian, "Pidrobka i fal'syfikatsiia istorychnykh dokumentiv na Ukraïni i Bilorusiï," *Naukovi zapysky Kyïvs'koho pedahohichnoho instytutu*, 1939 (3).

8. See Vvedenskii, *Lektsii*, 130–31.

9. One of the most detailed studies of the nature and recordkeeping function of the early record books from the Polish pre-partition period was prepared by the Ukrainian historian Iaroslav Dashkevych. Although it focuses on the extant Armenian documentation to be found both in Right-Bank and Western Ukraine, it provides a good scholarly introduction to the sources and relevant reference literature. Ia. R. Dashkevych, "Administratyvni, sudovi i finansovi knyhy na Ukraini v XIII–XVIII st. (Problematyka, stan, i metodyka doslidzhennia)," *Istorychni dzherela ta ikh vykorystannia* 4 (1969): 129–70. See also the general study of the early record books by A. I. Levitskii [O. I. Levyts'kyi], "Ob aktovykh knigakh, otnosiashchikhsia k istorii Iugo-Zapadnogo kraia i Malorossii," in *Trudy XI Arkheologicheskogo s"ezda v Kieve* 2 (Moscow, 1902): 55–82.

10. See Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, "The Fate of Early Records in Lviv Archives: Documentation from Western Ukraine under Polish Rule (Fifteenth Century to 1772)," *Slavonic and East European Review* 60, no. 3 (July 1982): 321–46, with references to earlier literature on the subject. In a comparative vein, see O. A. Kupchyns'kyi, "Z istoriï stvorennia naukovo-dovidkovoho aparatu do fondiv sudovo-administratyvnykh ustanov Ukraïny XV–XVIII st.," *Arkhivy Ukraïny*, 1976 (1): 27–35. Kupchyns'kyi surveys inventories prepared since the eighteenth century covering court record books from the Polish period in Western Ukraine (now in the Central State Historical Archive-L'viv [TsDIA-L]) as well as those for Right-Bank Ukraine from the early Kiev archive.

11. The provision for these local courts to continue under Lithuanian law was spelled out in the annexation documents preceding the Act of Union, the texts of which are printed in *Akta unji Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, ed. Stanisław Kutrzeba and Władysław Semkowicz (Cracow: PAU, 1932), 301–19.

12. On linguistic usage after the Union, see N. N. Iakovenko, "O iazykovom sostave gorodskikh i zemskikh knig Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy na protiazhenii XVII veka," in *Istoriograficheskie i istochnikovedcheskie problemy otechestvennoi istorii. Istochniki po sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Rossii i Ukrainy XVII–XIX vekov. Mezhvuzovskii sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, ed. N. P. Koval'skii [M. P. Koval's'kyi] et al. (Dnipropetrovs'k, 1983), 64–72.

13. See for example the report of Dombrovs'kyi to Bibikov on his July 1843 archeographic expedition in Volhynia, as published as an appendix in Zhurba, *Kyïvs'ka arkheohrafichna komisiia*, 135–38.

14. A. I. Levitskii describes the falsification procedure and comments on these developments in "Istoriia uchrezhdeniia," 16–18. See details in the more recent study by Vvedenskii, "Poddelka i fal'sifikatsiia," in *Lektsii*, 116–69.

15. See the text of the imperial ukaz of 1833 in *PSZ*, series 2, vol. 8, pt. 1, p. 171 (no. 6644—19 December 1833).

16. A full survey of previous registration and markups is still needed in the Kiev archive in connection with a complete description of remaining books.

17. The work of the commission and its inventorying efforts are described by L. A. Popova (*née* Protsenko), "Z istoriï zasnuvannia i diial'nosti Arkhivu davnikh aktiv u m. Kyievi," *Naukovo-informatsiinyi biuleten'*, 1962 (3): 28.

18. See the text of the imperial ukaz in *PSZ*, series 2, vol. 17, pt. 2, pp. 76–78 (no. 16163—3 November 1842).

19. For the work of these commissions, see Levitskii, "Istoriia uchrezhdeniia," 18–21; Vvedenskii, "Poddelka i fal'skifikatsiia," 133–42; and Popova, "Z istoriï," NIB, 1960 (3): 28–29. Reports of the 1842 commissions, including those for Kiev, Volhynia, and Podolia gubernias, and related correspondence with the Ministry of Justice (1851–1852), remain among the records of the Heraldry Department of the Senate in the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA—formerly TsGIA SSSR) in St. Petersburg, fond 1342/57/318 and 321, but there are no inventories included. See also the 1852 report on the 1833 and 1842 commissions, in *Sbornik materialov* 2: 190–201. For examples of documentary falsification in Belorussian and Lithuanian lands, see N. N. Ulashchik, *Predposylki krest'ianskoi reformy 1861 g. v Litve i Zapadnoi Belorussi* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 91–99.

20. Popova, "Z istoriï," *NIB,* 1960 (3): 28. Undoubtedly due in part to remodelling, the present archives were unable to locate them for my examination.

21. Popova, "Z istoriï," 29. All the record books described apparently perished during the Second World War. The Skvyra inventory remains in the State Archive of Kiev Oblast' (DAKO), fond 231, *opis'*3, *delo* 2, among the records of the Skvyra *uezd* court, but was not available for my examination.

22. I am grateful to archivists in TsDIA-K for checking the stamps for me, but time did not permit a thorough survey or the determination of which books from which areas were registered in 1842.

23. A trusted representative of Nicholas I, Dmitrii Gavrilovich Bibikov (1792–1870) served as Kiev Military Governor and Governor-General of Kiev, Volhynia, and Podolia from 1837 to 1852. He subsequently served as Minister of Internal Affairs (1852–1855).

24. V. Ia. Shul'gin, "Iugo-Zapadnyi krai pod upravleniem D. G. Bibikova (1838–1853)," *Drevniaia i novaia Rossiia*, 1879 (5): 5–32; (6): 89–131. I am grateful to Oleh Zhurba for referring me to the Shul'gin analysis.

25. See "Rech Kievskogo voennogo, Podol'skogo i Volynskogo general' gubernatora, general-adiutanta Dmitriia Gavrilovicha Bibikova k pomeshchikam Kievskoi gubernii, 8 Maia 1851 goda," as published in *Istoricheskii sbornik Vol'noi russkoi tipografii v Londone*, Book 1, ed. A. I. Gertsen and N. P. Ogarev (1859, facsimile edition, Moscow: Nauka, 1971), 141.

26. Quoted by Vvedenskii, *Lektsii*, 141–42. See also A. V. Romanovich-Slavatinskii, *Dvorianstvo v Rossii* (Kiev, 1912), 58.

27. D. G. Bibikov to L. A. Perovskii, 30.IV.1843, as published by Zhurba, *Kyïvs'ka arkheohrafichna komisiia*, p. 134. The text was earlier quoted by A. I. Levitskii, *Piatidesiatiletie Kievskoi komissii dlia razbora drevnikh aktov, 1843–1893. Istoricheskaia zapiska o eë deiatel'nosti* (Kiev: Tip. S. V. Kul'zhenko, 1893), 13.

28. Born in Poltava to an old Cossack gentry family, the ethnographer and historian Mykhailo Oleksandrovych Maksymovych (1804–1873) was educated in Moscow, where after receiving his degree he became a lecturer in botany and in 1833 full professor at Moscow University. In 1834 he was appointed a professor of Russian literature and rector of the newly established St. Vladimir University in Kiev. He held the post of rector only for the first year, but continued to teach until his retirement in 1845. See V. S. Ikonnikov, *Biograficheskii slovar' professorov i prepodavatelei Imperatorskogo Universiteta sv. Vladimira (1834–1884)* (Kiev, 1884), 379–97.

29. N. D. Ivanishev (Mykola Dmytrovych Ivanyshev) (1804–1874), a legal historian, was vice-president of the Commission for the Analysis of Early Acts. After 1862 he became the rector of St. Vladimir University. Regarding Ivanishev's role, see L. P. Lapteva, "Professor Universiteta Sv. Vladimira N. D. Ivanishev (1811–1874) i ego deiatel'nost' v Kievskoi arkheograficheskoi komissii,"

Ukraïns'kyi arkheohrafichnyi shchorichnyk n.s. 1(1992): 47–58. See also the tributory volume published afer his death: A. V. Romanovich-Slavatinskii, *Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' N. D. Ivanisheva, rektora Universiteta sv. Vladimira i vitse-predsedatelia Kievskoi arkheograficheskoi komissii* (St. Petersburg: Tip. V. Gratsianskogo, 1876), originally published serially in *Drevniaia i novaia Rossiia*, 1876, nos. 1–3, 6–7. See also the biographic sketch of Ivanishev in Ikonnikov, *Biograficheskii slovar'*, 207–24.

30. Ivan Alekseevich Borisov (1800–1857) started as a professor at the Kiev Theological Academy in 1823 and became rector in 1836. In 1848 be became Archbishop of Kherson and Tavria. He was deeply interested in archeology and antiquities and was active in archeographic activities.

31. Vasilii Fedorovich Dombrovskii (Vasyl' Fedorovych Dombrovs'kyi) (1810–1845), professor and the first head of the *kafedra* of Russian history at the university in Kiev, served on the archeographic commission until his untimely death in 1845. See the biographic sketch in Ikonnikov, *Biograficheskii slovar'*, 182–86, and the more recent article by O. I. Zhurba and M. P. Koval's'kyi, "Znachennia diial'nosti V. F. Dombrovs'koho u stanovlenni Kyïvs'koï arkheohrafichnoï komisiï," *Visnyk Kyïvs'koho universytetu*. Ser. *Istorychni nauky*, 1989, vyp. 31, pp. 48–55.

32. Baron Stanislav I. de Chodoire (Shoduar) (1792–1858), part-time teacher in the Kiev-Podil Gentry High School.

33. M. E. Pisarev headed Bibikov's chancery in Kiev. No further biographical data have been found for Pisarev.

34. Zhurba, *Kyïvs'ka arkheohrafichna komisiia*, 38.

35. Quoted by Romanovich-Slavatinskii, *Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' N. D. Ivanisheva,* 121.

36. Quoted by Lapteva, "Professor Universiteta Sv. Vladimira N. D. Ivanishev," 49.

37. From the 1842 journal of the second meeting of the commission, as quoted by Zhurba, *Kyïvs'ka arkheohrafichna komisiia*, 144.

38. See Romanovich-Slavatinskii, *Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' N. D. Ivanisheva,* especially 91–123. See the summary of Bibikov's proposal in *Sbornik materialov* 2:86–91. Parts of Ivanishev's report and Bibikov's plan are quoted extensively by Levitskii, "Istoriia uchrezhdeniia," *ChIONL*17 (1903), sec. 2, pt. 1, pp. 22–35.

39. Many of Bibikov's arguments, together with more details about the failure of the earlier 1833 and 1842 commissions and the persistence of the problems of falsification of documents, were presented in an 1852 report prepared by the Ministry of Justice, printed in *Sbornik materialov* 2:190–201. The developments in St. Petersburg leading up to the establishment of the archive, together with lengthy quotations from many of the texts involved, are chronicled by Levitskii [Levyts'kyi], "Istoriia uchrezhdeniia", *ChIONL* 17 (1903), sec. 2, pt. 3, pp. 37–72. An additional part of Levitskii's study was promised at the end of the second part (p. 72), but was apparently never published.

40. Anton Iakovlevich Krasovskii (Antoni Krasowski)(b. 1810), of Polish Roman Catholic background, completed his degree in the Philosophical Faculty of Kharkiv University and started as a secondary-school teacher at the Kiev gymnasium, before becoming the librarian of the university (1845–1865).

41. During the first decade the permanent archivists (who received 350 rubles a year) were successively M. I. Iakubovskii (Mykhailo Ivanovych Iakubovs'kyi) (b. 1808) until 1859, L. I. Lens from 1859–1861, and Eduard Vikent'evich Stankevich from 1861 to 1866. Stankevich was first appointed to "chancery service" in the archive in mid-1859. He had earlier studied in a Minsk gymnasium, according to his appointment paper dated 15 June 1859. TsDIA-K, 707/25/248.

42. E. V. Stankevich, "Spisok aktovykh knig, khraniashchikhsia v Kievskom tsentral'nom arkhive," *Universitetskie izvestiia*, 1862 (6): 1–38; (9): 39–44, 45–68; 1863 (1): 69–92; (2): 93–108; (5): 109–124; (6): 124–48; 1864 (6): 149–72; (8): 173–88; (12): 189–216. Stankevich's name appears as compiled in only one of the published segments; no other names appear, but quite possibly other archivists were involved. At the end of the brief introduction to the first segment (p. 9), Stankevich cites the total number of books received as 6,027, but that figure was elsewhere listed as a misprint; the correct figure for that date was 5,838.

43. A copy of the collected offprints of these lists bound together for the later archive director I. M. Kamanin, together with his notes, marginalia, and supplements, is held in his personal fond in TsDIA-K (fond 237, opys 1, no. 73); handwritten lists continue the coverage (nos. 5839–5938), but there is no indication of the date of the final additions. Because of the existence of this copy, the Stankevich lists have often been attributed to Kamanin. The latest published report (as of 1 January 1913) before the First World War quotes a total figure of 5,920 record books in the archive; thus, presumably, Kamanin's list was continued later. "Otchet o sostoianii Kievskogo tsentral'nogo arkhiva dlia drevnikh aktovykh knig gubernii Kievskoi, Podol'skoi i Volynskoi v 1912-m godu," *Universitetskiia izvestiia*, 1913, no. 6, pt. 1, pp. 1–3.

44. Catalogues and related survey literature of the corresponding Vilnius archive, see Grimsted, *Archives: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia*, 372–77.

45. See Vvedenskii, *Lektsii*, 152–61.

46. See, for example, from Volhynia an 1864 list of 3,879 individuals with explanation of each case, with a cumulative total of 13,220, RGIA, fond 1343/57/421. For Kiev gubernia, a list dated 9.IV.1864 lists 1,352 families with a total of 6,610 persons, fond 1343/57/423 (339 folios). For Podolia, a list dated 15.II.1864 lists 1,152 families, fond 1343/57/426 (371 folios).

47. *PSZ* 44, pt. 2, p. 226 (no. 47592—31 October 1869), reprinted in *Sbornik materialov* 1:176. Regarding the falsification investigations, see also D. Ia. Samokvasov, *Arkhivnoe delo v Rossii, 1852–1902,* Book 1: *Sovremennoe russkoe arkhivnoe nestroenie*, appendix 1 "Razbornye, opisatel'nye i poverochnye arkhivnye komissii."

48. See the report on the Kiev archive dated 12.VIII.1868–10.II.1870 (RGIA, fond 1343/57/440) and the later report dated 17.XII.1909 (fond 1343/57/579).

49. K. F. Strashkevich (Kindrat Fedorovych Strashkevych) (1815–1868). See the biographic sketch in Ikonnikov, *Biograficheskii slovar' professorov*, 624–32.

50. *Opis' aktovykh knig Kievskogo tsentral'nogo arkhiva drevnikh aktov*, 80 inventories in 70 volumes (Kiev, 1869–1909—titles, compilers, and printers vary). Note the complete microfiche edition, with a preface by P. K. Grimsted and correlated chart of available inventories (Leiden: IDC, 1987). A full annotated list of the inventories produced with reference to their current archival code numbers, including those produced and not published is included in Grimsted, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR. Ukraine and Moldavia,* Book 1: *General Bibliography and Institutional Directory* (Princeton, 1988), 186–91.

51. *Pamiatniki, izdannye Vremennoiu komissieiu dlia razbora drevnikh aktov*, 4 vols. (Kiev, 1845–1859); 2d ed., vol. 1 (Kiev, 1848); 2d/3d ed., 3 vols. in 2 (Kiev, 1898; vol. 1 includes the previous first two volumes; and vol. 2 the previous third volume with personal and geographic indexes for both volumes).

52. *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, 35 vols. in 8 series (Kiev, 1859–1911). See also the discussion of the series, with emphasis on the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century documentation included, by Koval'skii, *Istochnikovedenie i arkheografiia istorii Ukrainy XVI–pervoi poloviny XVII v.*, part 2, pp. 55–76.

53. See the commentary about Ivanishev's plan in Levitskii, *Piatidesiatiletie*, 85–89.

54. See the corresponding L'viv series, *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z archiwum tak zwanego Bernardyńskiego we Lwowie* , 25 vols. (L'viv [Lwów], 1868–1935). For a recent survey of the L'viv publication efforts, see N. P. Koval'skii, *Istochnikovedenie i arkheografiia istorii Ukrainy XVI–pervoi poloviny XVII v.*, part 3: *Kharakteristika publikatsii istochnikov na inostrannykh iazykakh*, especially pp. 29–38, which lists contents of the Polish-language AGZ series, but does not analyze its contrasting purposes and methods.

55. See N. D. Ivanishev, "Otzyv Kievskoi komissii drevnikh aktov na obvineniia nekotorykh gazet i zhurnalov po povodu vykhoda v svet II-i chasti Arkhiva Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii," in *Sochineniia N. D. Ivanisheva*, ed. A. V. Romanovich-Slavatinskii and K. A. Tsarevskii (Kiev, 1876), 417–51.

56. See V. O. Romanovs'kyi, "Kyïvs'kyi tsentral'nyi arkhiv davnikh aktiv," *Arkhivna sprava*, 1925 (1): 86.

57. Shul'gin, "Iugo-Zapadnyi krai," *Drevniaia i novaia Rossiia*, 1879 (6): 131.

58. Levitskii, *Piatidesiatiletie*. In addition to a review of the work of the commission, the volume provides a complete list of its publications (pp. 124–33) and notes about the individuals involved in the operation.

59. "Sistematicheskii perechen' izdanii Komissii dlia razbora drevnikh aktov (s 1845 po 1910 gg.)," in *Sbornik statei i materialov po istorii Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, izdavaemyi Komissiei dlia razbora drevnikh aktov*, vol. 1, sec. 3 (Moscow, 1911): 21–31; "Letopis' zaniatii Komissii (1911–1914 gg.)," ibid., vol. 2, sec. 3 (Moscow, 1916): 1–3. The bibliography includes analytics of the documentary publication series issued by the Kiev Commission, including the *Pamiatniki* series and *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*.

60. See the forthcoming study of the fate of the Kiev archive during the war by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted and Hennadii Boriak, being prepared for publication by the Institute of Ukrainian Archeography.

61. See the earlier recommendation for such a project by Kyrylo Vselobovs'kyi, "Do pytannia pro stvorennia naukovo-dovidkovoho aparatu do aktovykh knyh XVI–XVIII st.," in *Ukraïns'ka arkheohrafiia. Suchasnyi stan ta perspektyvy rozvytku. Tezy dopovidei respublikans'koï narady, hruden' 1988 r.* (Kiev, 1988), 233–36.

The Social Role and Economic Status of Blind Peasant Minstrels in Ukraine

WILLIAM NOLL

An article published in 1904 describes the results of a survey conducted in 1903 in Kiev gubernia on the numbers and kinds of *kobzari* and *lirnyky,* the blind peasant minstrels of Ukraine.[1] The survey was the result of calls for such research at the twelfth meeting of the South-Western Imperial Archeological Society in Kharkiv in 1902.[2] The survey was flawed in various ways. Among many other drawbacks, repertory and other basic characteristics of music practice were not included in the questionnaire. In addition, large numbers of minstrels were likely left out of the survey count. Nevertheless, it can be said that the survey reflected at least a partial regional census of Ukrainian minstrels of the time: in Kiev gubernia 289 minstrels were surveyed. Of these only three were reported to have been *kobzari*, and 286 were *lirnyky*.[3] On the Left Bank, Hnat Khotkevych at about the same time found thirty-seven *kobzari* and twenty-eight *lirnyky* in just two counties (Rus. *uezd*, Ukr. *povit*) of Kharkiv gubernia.[4] Other, more modest attempts at surveying the number of blind minstrels were undertaken, such as in the Poltava region, where in the 1880s Martynovych found (haphazardly and unsystematically) 375 itinerant musicians.[5] Although these surveys were conducted in only a limited part of Ukrainian territory, it is possible to extrapolate from them and make an estimate for Ukraine as a whole. On the conservative side, it seems certain that there were well over two thousand blind minstrels in the Ukrainian countryside in the early twentieth century, and likely even three thousand.[6] On the more extravagant side, Slastion estimated for Poltava gubernia alone over three thousand blind minstrels, which seems high.[7]

By the early 1950s, there were only a handful of blind minstrels left in the Ukrainian countryside. Today there are none.[8] Given the fact that peasant minstrels had thrived in Ukrainian villages for at least two hundred years, and possibly longer, the questions "What happened to them?" and "Why did they disappear?" are not only intriguing, but also important to our understanding of the history of rural expressive culture in Ukraine as well as of the cultural policies of the Russian and, later, the Soviet empires.

It is useful first of all to place the blind minstrels in their cultural milieu of peasant society and analyze *in situ* their social role and economic status in the village. I shall do this by comparing certain music norms of the blind minstrels with those of other village musicians. Next, I shall discuss unique features of the repertory of the blind minstrels, examining the significance of this repertory in village life and how their role and status changed through time. After this, I shall examine how and why certain cultural policies of the Soviet state likely favored

the radical elimination of the musical art of the blind minstrels. This in turn will illustrate the significance of specific rural music practices in the life of the village and the general role and status of musicians in rural civil society. More broadly considered, this examination will help to illustrate the differences between the expressive culture of peasant society and that of the national state cultures constructed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

I cite here primarily those sources from the mid–nineteenth century to the present that utilize the ethnographic method of face-to-face interviews conducted during fieldwork with participants in the activities in question (here the blind minstrels, their families and certain officials), or (less often) observations directly from fieldworkers. Sources of questionable authenticity or consisting primarily of second-hand accounts I have rejected outright. Many philological methods, especially those practiced before the late nineteenth century, produce highly questionable interpretations of cultural history, often based on blatantly false data. Because I largely reject non-ethnographic data as source material, the past of the blind minstrels before the mid–nineteenth century is not discussed here, since there are virtually no reliable ethnographic sources with which to undertake such a discussion. The nature of, and conclusions that derive from, the small number of historical written sources on the blind minstrels from before the mid–nineteenth century (before ethnographic method was utilized), then, produce problems different from those derived from ethnographic material. Important methodological questions regarding their use in a manner consistent with current social science practice dictate that they receive separate treatment. Therefore, they are not discussed here.[9]

ECONOMIC NORMS OF GROUPS OF MUSIC MAKERS

Some of the most important musicians in the Ukrainian village up to collectivization can be placed into three separate groups: blind minstrels, instrumental music specialists, and women music specialists. Considered together, members of these three groups of music makers carried special and unique performance practices that defined much of the musical life of the village in most regions, including many of the symbols of historical, regional, religious, and even national consciousness. The musicians in all three groups were farmers in the sense that they and their families relied upon the agricultural labor of the peasant family enterprise for at least part of their maintenance, while music was a source of supplemental income. All peasant households were engaged in both farming and home industries or services, and music activities can be viewed in light of these broad peasant economic norms. There were rarely "professionals" in the village, as the term is commonly understood today—the local blacksmith, the local wheelwright, the village tailor, even the local miller as well as local musicians, relied on farming to

sustain themselves. Their crafts, home industries, or specialties were supplemental to their agricultural income. Their economic role as specialists was part of a broad economic pattern in peasant society.[10]

This pattern included the activities of the *kobzari* and *lirnyky*, most of whom had families and homes. Most were not the homeless vagabonds portrayed in Shevchenko's poem "Perebendia" in *Kobzar* as well as elsewhere. This inaccurate characterization of the *kobzar* as a pitiful old vagabond is especially unfortunate because it became so widely held, even among some specialists. Perhaps the blind minstrels are better thought of as traveling musicians who worked on the road for roughly half the year, the other half spent at home with their families.[11] It is inappropriate to apply the term "professional" to the blind minstrels, or to any others who utilize their skills or craft for only half the year and derive only part of their income from this activity.

In certain months, the minstrels traveled through villages and small towns, stopping and performing next to churches, in market squares, near fairs or monasteries, or among village houses. From plying their craft they earned cash and foodstuffs, most of the former taken home whenever possible and pooled with other income of the peasant family enterprise. An especially lucrative performance context was the festival for the local patron saint of a village parish (in Ukrainian, *khram).*[12] Some minstrels had pupils, others did not. Generally, pupils paid for their learning time. Most minstrels probably did not travel great distances, but only to villages and towns no more than a few days' journey by foot from their home village. Others traveled widely, even two or three hundred kilometers or more from their village. In those months when they were not traveling, they were home with their families, who took care of the agricultural aspects of the peasant household.[13] The blind minstrels were not idle in the off months. Most often they, like other blind villagers, spent working time making rope by twisting hemp, or woodworking, or other tasks that could be carried out while stationary. Those who had arable land (a field) either rented it out, or their families worked it.[14] Most minstrels rarely performed in their own village, and especially not in the off months. They were known there as neighbors and not as the special characters that they were in places far from home. As such, they could not always easily seek a living on the streets of their home village. In addition, in the off months there was a great deal of other work to do, which was family or home based.

The next group of village music makers, the instrumental music specialists, spent most of their time as musicians in the village at weddings, or sometimes during *dosvitky*. The latter (known in some regions as *vechernytsi*) were evening gatherings of young people held from autumn to Lent, usually in the home of a local widow or unmarried woman who rented out her home to girls and young unmarried women of a given *kutok* ("corner") of a village.[15] There village girls and young women gathered to sew, embroider, and spin as well as to sing and tell jokes and gossip. Later in the evenings, boys and young unmarried men sometimes came by, and the young people would socialize, sing, dance, joke, and so on. Two or

three instrumental musicians (i.e., fiddlers, hammered dulcimer players, drummers, bass players, and others in various regional combinations of instruments) were occasionally hired by the boys, who would pool their resources to pay the musicians.[16] However, weddings were the economic mainstay of instrumental musicians, who were almost always men. They were paid a combination of cash, foodstuffs and in some regions linen products for their services. Their social status in the village often tended to be rather low, as they were viewed as individuals who drank too much and were frequently away from home for long periods of time (i.e., during performances at village weddings). They were sometimes also viewed as undesirable because of their perceived contacts with Satan, or their connections with black magic.[17] They generally did not have paying pupils. Their activities as music specialists were no more than a supplement to their farm-derived income. Agricultural matters took up most of their labor time, as they did the time of virtually all peasants.[18]

Vocal music practice at weddings was a separate and unique repertory, dominated by women and girls. Most of the vocal music rituals associated with the complex wedding sequence of the village were sung by both relatives and specially invited guests, some of whom assumed ritual characters that dictated the role each played in the wedding sequence. Most of these character roles were for women only. Whenever possible, villagers invited the best singers to fill those character roles, that is, they invited individuals who could be relied upon to remember the special ritual songs of the three- to seven-day village wedding, and who knew and could perform the hundreds, or even thousands of verses of song texts in more or less fixed local sequence. Not everyone in the village had the ability to remember the intricate nuances of the wedding sequence. Villagers knew who the best singers were, and they were in demand, for it was unthinkable not to properly realize the ritual sequence of events at the wedding.[19] Although they were held in esteem and enjoyed a consistently high social status, these women music specialists were virtually never paid in cash for their services. Indeed, no one seems to have thought of their special skills as a payable service. Occasionally they were given extra foodstuffs, or still more rarely, linen products. The activities associated with ritual vocal wedding music occupied a small percentage of these women's time, which as with the instrumental music specialists, was devoted primarily to the concerns of the peasant family agricultural enterprise.[20]

Although this is only a thumbnail sketch, one can see that the economic activities of these three groups of village music makers were in some ways similar, in other ways different. The minstrels, the instrumental music specialists, and the women music specialists derived a supplemental income from their activities as village musicians, that is, income supplemental to the agricultural labor of the musicians' household. However, the specific activities and contexts associated with music as well as the economic status of these three peasant groups differed. The minstrels traveled widely as musicians, while the instrumental music specialists and the women specialists performed virtually always in music contexts in

their native village or in contiguous villages. Yet all three groups of musicians were part of the agricultural life of the village. Their economic role was similar in that music was only one part of the total income of the peasant family enterprise. It was dissimilar in that the *kobzari* and *lirnyky* usually earned a large percentage, in many cases even most, of the total family income through music, while the instrumental music specialists earned only a small percentage of total family income through music, and the women music specialists at weddings did not earn cash at all through music.

In contrast to the economic norms, the social role of each of these three groups was not at all the same. In particular, the blind minstrels held a unique place in peasant society. Both the instrumental music specialists and the women music specialists were absolutely vital elements in village ritual life, either in events that occurred according to the calendar or in events that occurred in conjunction with family life, or both. The blind minstrels had nothing to do with that. They were not a part of the ritual life of the village in the sense that they did not usually take part as musicians in weddings, funerals, or calendric events and rituals. In villages in the Kharkiv region in the 1920s, *lirnyky* were openly and frankly contemptuous of most of the music repertory of the village, calling it "street" *(vulychna)* music.[21] The minstrels were viewed, and viewed themselves, as being different from other village musicians, many believing that they had a special purpose in life, one provided by God in the form of their blindness and in the nature of the music they performed (i.e., their repertory).[22] While the instrumental music specialists and the women music specialists were admired by villagers for their skills and usefulness to the community as participants in ritual events, many of the *kobzari* and *lirnyky* seem to have carried in the village a kind of *avtorytet*—a moral authority. This is one of the differences in social role that set the blind minstrels apart from all other musicians in the village, and it is this difference that would later have disastrous consequences for the minstrels in the early years of Soviet power.

REPERTORY AND MORAL AUTHORITY OF THE BLIND MINSTRELS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

To understand why the minstrels carried a kind and degree of moral authority in the village, it is necessary to briefly examine what, where and for whom they performed.[23] Although they were peasant born and bred, and although theirs was an art based on village music practices as well as rural textual themes, the minstrels and their music were beyond ritual, beyond the village itself. Their social role can be seen as having been entirely different from that of other peasant musicians. They were the bearers of some of the most important symbols in rural life, particularly those symbols that today would be called religious or national, but that then were deeply imbedded in peasant society, and as such were inseparable from

the daily lives of rural dwellers. It is probably not an exaggeration to say that the minstrels were among the most important groups of people in the cultural history of rural Ukraine. Their repertory consisted primarily of three components: first of all, religious music; second, the epics that in publications are usually called *dumy* as well as historical songs; and third, satirical and humorous songs as well as dance music and other genres. The religious songs were by far the most important repertory component for the minstrels (and for their audiences), both in terms of income and social status, and for both *kobzari* and *lirnyky*. The epics at that time were of limited importance, while the genres of the third component (satirical songs and dance tunes) appear to have been of increasing importance to minstrels from the late nineteenth century to collectivization.

In the seventy years preceding the arrival of Soviet power in the countryside, the genre with the largest number of individual pieces and the one most often performed by virtually every *kobzar* and *lirnyk* was the religious song, known in some, but not all villages as the *psal'ma.* The ethnographic literature from the second half of the nineteenth century conclusively indicates that every minstrel knew many of these, often twenty or more. As in any other oral genre, the *psal'my* varied from performer to performer, from performance to performance, as well as from each other in terms of musical style and form.[24] The most basic formal differences were that some had strophic form, while others were performed in a recitative that was also common for the heroic epics. The minstrels also sang or recited various prayers on request. Unfortunately, systematic collection and analysis of the *psal'my* and especially of the prayers was not undertaken by all ethnographers. Several sources document *psal'my* texts, collected as early as the mid–nineteenth century.[25] However, far fewer music transcriptions were made.[26] What we mostly have from the scholarly literature of the time are the titles of the *psal'my*, sometimes with general descriptions, and less often with the frequency of their performance.[27] The actual performance practices of *psal'my* were seldom considered by the ethnographers, and today are lost for all but a few of the minstrels.

The second genre that the blind minstrels performed, and the one most widely collected by nineteenth-century scholars, is the historical and heroic epic that today is commonly known as the *duma.* The word *duma* was formerly never used in the village, nor was it used by the blind minstrels, who had other words or terms for this part of their repertory. These terms varied greatly by region, locale, time period, and from one minstrel to the next in one region, e.g., *kozats'ki pisni, kozats'ki psal'my, nevol'nyts'ki.*[28] In the Kharkiv region in the 1920s, the word *prychta* or *rozkaz* was widely used to refer not only to what we today would consider *dumy*, but also to *psal'my*, that is, either word described both genres.[29] In other cases the one word *psal'ma* was used to refer to both genres, e.g., the *kobzar* Mykhailo Kravchenko called *dumy* "*zaporoz'ki psal'my*."[30] *Duma* in fact is an old literary word that gained wide currency among intellectuals in the nineteenth century. Although today the word *duma* is usually regarded as describing

something quintessentially Ukrainian, up to the 1920s it was probably virtually unknown in villages in most regions, including those on the Left Bank, where most of the *kobzari* lived.

As a performance genre, the repertory of *dumy* up to collectivization was typical of oral performance art in that it does not seem to have been a unified whole, but varied to a certain extent through time and by region as well as by performer in any given time and region. This part of the minstrels' repertory was by no means integral to the performance practices of any one minstrel. Most minstrels in the second half of the nineteenth century knew only one, or two to four *dumy*, while the most famous (and exceptional) knew five, eight, or even ten. Some minstrels, including both *kobzari* and *lirnyky*, did not perform *dumy* at all.[31] Virtually all minstrels of the time performed many *psal'my*. It is almost impossible to know now what percentage of blind minstrels did or did not perform *dumy*. The ethnographic literature of the time is flawed in this regard, because many of the ethnographers did not conduct active fieldwork among those minstrels who did not know *dumy*, virtually ignoring them. One of the most active fieldworkers, Opanas Slastion, frankly admitted that he did not take note, and made no written record, of the existence of minstrels who did not know and perform *dumy*, as they were of no interest to him.[32]

Dumy were performed primarily in Left Bank regions, to a more limited extent in those Right Bank regions contiguous with the Dnieper, and not at all in western Ukraine. Data from the ethnographic literature of the time indicate that it is a mistake to assume a dichotomy in repertory between the *kobzari* and *lirnyky* of Left Bank Ukraine in the nineteenth century, a common assumption among many *dumy* scholars. On the contrary, it seems that most *kobzari* and *lirnyky* in Left Bank regions held a more or less common repertory, composed primarily of *psal'my*, *dumy*, satirical songs, and dance ditties. Many *lirnyky* on the Left Bank commonly performed *dumy*. For example, the *lirnyk* Nykyfor Dudka knew two *dumy* and eleven *psal'my*, the *lirnyk* Stepan Tertii knew three *dumy* and twenty-three *psal'my*, and Slastion described one *lirnyk* who knew 120 *psal'my* and *kozats'ki pisni* (Cossack songs).[33] Virtually all *kobzari* performed primarily *psal'my*. Khotkevych estimated that most *kobzari* in the Kharkiv region in the 1890s knew three to five *dumy*, and twelve to twenty *psal'my*, but some knew many more: Pavlo Hashchenko knew forty-two *psal'my* and Petro Drevchenko knew forty-four.[34] The same was true in the Chernihiv region and Poltava region. The *kobzar* Khvedir Kholodnyi (born in the late 1820s) knew seven *dumy* but seventy *psal'my*. The *kobzar* Mykhailo Kravchenko knew five *dumy* but twenty-three *psal'my*. Even one of the *kobzari* who knew more *dumy* (mostly learned from books) than was usual for that time (as recorded in the ethnographic literature), Terentii Makarovych Parkhomenko, knew ten *dumy*, but twenty-eight *psal'my*.[35]

Philologists believe that some thirty-two *dumy* were known to one degree or another in nineteenth-century Ukraine, each with several or even dozens of variants. However, this can be seen as a misleading notion. As noted above, an

individual minstrel most often knew only two to four (often fewer, rarely more) *dumy*. Furthermore, as Kateryna Hrushevs'ka notes, of the thirty-two or so *dumy* collected during the nineteenth century, only ten or fewer were actually extant, i.e., still actively performed by village minstrels, in the late nineteenth century.[36] The others, she believes, were merely carry-overs from an earlier period and existed in published form only, not in oral practice. In Sperans'kyi's survey of the repertory of thirty minstrels from the Left Bank, mostly *kobzari* active between ca. 1880 and 1902, he found ninety *psal'my*, twenty *dumy,* and twenty satirical songs. Of these, only thirty *psal'my*, eight *dumy,* and eight satirical songs were collectively held by more than ten percent of those surveyed.[37] Whether or not most of the *dumy* found in published nineteenth-century collections were merely carry-overs from the perhaps distant past, when *dumy* are viewed as only one (and at that not the major) part of a larger oral performance practice of peasant minstrels, they look different than when viewed in the static analysis of a collection of individual texts. Many questions remain as to the possible distribution, aesthetic standards, and meaning for the peasants of *dumy* performance practices in the nineteenth century.

The genre known as *psal'my*, most philologists would likely agree, is completely separate from the *dumy*. This conclusion is based on an analysis of collected texts. However, another interpretation is possible if these two genres are examined from the viewpoint of the actual ethnographic material, of performance context and native (i.e., peasant) perception. In the village context, little or no distinction was made between *psal'ma* and *duma*. In the late 1920s, one researcher was told by a blind *lirnyk* in the Kharkiv region that there were two *psal'my* "pro Oleksiia" (about Alexis). One was "pro Oleksiia Bozhoho cholovika" (about Alexis, a man of God), and the other was "pro Oleksiia Popovycha" (about Alexis Popovych). As philologists understand the terms, the first was a *psal'ma*, the second a *duma*. However, villagers, including the blind minstrels, often had no taxonomy, no system of classification to conceptually separate the two genres. Frequently they distinguished one performance (and thus one genre) from another only by the specific titles.[38] To a certain extent, the *psal'my* and the *dumy* were, for them, a single performance genre, i.e., the *prychta* or *rozkaz* described earlier. Both *psal'my* and *dumy* were rendered in the same performance contexts, by the same performers, for the same peasant audiences, in a musical style that was often identical.[39] Furthermore, if we group the *psal'my* and *dumy* together as a single perceived unit—as in fact many villagers did—the two genres together can be seen as a larger whole that contained some of the most important symbols of village life. This is to say, both the melodies and the texts of the two can be seen as complementing each other. Not only were the two often part of a single musical performance style, but the texts of the *psal'my* and the *dumy* contain collateral symbolic material. Both reflect high moral standards, the inculcation of fidelity and loyalty to one's family, one's people, and one's religious beliefs. The one repertory group derives its message and its power from the spiritual quest of human life, especially from Christian values, while the other contains lessons

derived from both the secular and the spiritual world. The texts of both extol the virtuous and recommend contempt for sinners, traitors, and slackers.[40] Nothing comparable in symbolic content exists in the performance practices of other peasant music specialists nor in any other part of village music practice in Ukraine.

The unique and multifaceted character of the music practices of the blind minstrels of Ukraine was sometimes obscured by the very scholarship that tried to bring it to light. The reasons for this are to be found in the characteristic features of East European scholarship of the time. Most of the Ukrainian and Russian intellectuals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who collected material from the minstrels were not interested in their musical culture, or in the minstrels as musicians, but only in collecting texts from them, which the scholars could later publish. The idea apparently was to publish the "poetry" of the nation.[41] Until approximately the last third of the nineteenth century, most of these scholars were philologists or historians who usually made no attempt to place the texts either in their performance or musical contexts. That they provided little or no information about the musicians, or the performance contexts, or the methods they used in collecting the material, is understandable as part of the scholarly limitations of the time. More troubling for us today is that some of them literally altered the texts that they were collecting, deleting repetitions and rearranging sections so that they would neatly fit into verses, like urban poetry.[42] In still other cases, they simply made up texts of their own, pretending that they had been "discovered" from some ancient *kobzar*. These practices put the usefulness of most of the early literature into question. Some of these scholars were likely motivated by an interest in constructing an image of national consciousness based on heroic epics and historical songs, a national poetry that could be compared to similar genres and national poetry from other parts of Europe.

It was not until the 1850s or 1860s that scholars attempted to directly record the village voice, and identify their interpretations or analyses as a separate section of their publications. Another aspect of the earlier method was continued, however—that of concentrating on the texts and ignoring the actual performance practices. Moreover, most collectors of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (and a large percentage of scholars right up to the present) ignored or paid little attention to the religious aspects of the minstrel's repertory. Today, more than a hundred years later, one can only speculate about their reasons for doing so. Perhaps they contemptuously considered religious elements in the minstrels' performance practices a degradation of a once exclusively secular practice, of Cossack origin. In addition, overtly religious elements did not lend themselves to an easy and direct national identification. Orthodox psalmody was not unique to Ukrainians, but found among all of Ukraine's Orthodox neighbors. It seems possible that the researchers of the time deliberately and selectively sought out those aspects of the minstrels' repertory that were unique to Cossack Ukraine, while they deleted from their studies most materials that fit less neatly into a national program, much as Slastion simply ignored those minstrels who did not perform *dumy* (see above).[43]

One revealing source for this attitude is a letter from the ethnomusicologist Klyment Kvitka to the folklorist Filaret Kolessa in 1908 discussing the terms of their agreement, by which Kolessa would travel to the Poltava region to record the music of *kobzari* on wax cylinders. The expedition was secretly funded by Lesia Ukraïnka, Kvitka's wife. In the letter, Kvitka instructed Kolessa that the secret benefactor (Ukraïnka) wished that Kolessa seek out only *kobzari*, not *lirnyky*, and that he record only *dumy*. The specific instructions were to ignore "the repertory of the *lirnyky* [sic] as well as *psal'my*, *kozachky*, and so forth." Kvitka went on to explain the reasoning: that *psal'my* and other aspects of the repertory would still long survive, but that there was very little time left to research the *dumy*, which he and the benefactor felt were quickly dying out.[44] Of course they were wrong about the *psal'my*, but they had no way of predicting the turn of events and the suppression of religious culture and its institutions and rituals under Soviet power.

Finally, most of the researchers of the time ignored the obvious fact that the minstrels were above all else performing musicians. Although this fact seems obvious, it is only tangentially treated or discussed in a large percentage of the ethnographic, folklore, and philological literature from Eastern Europe. The "melody," as they call the musical sound, is regarded by them as separate from the "song" or printed text. This of course reflects a widespread, although no less regrettable, practice in folklore studies, not only in Eastern Europe but in Western Europe and North America, especially from before 1950 or so. The usual result of this application is a distortion of the actual performance practices, the expressive culture as it exists. If the minstrels were musicians, their art was performance, live musical sound rendered spontaneously and open to all the vagaries of oral art.[45] A musico-sociological analysis would seem to be a basic necessary element in attempting even a cursory examination of *dumy*. Concentrating exclusively on a static textual analysis provides, at best, an incomplete knowledge of the performance practices of these musicians, and at worst a misrepresentation of Ukrainian culture.[46]

The *kobzari* and *lirnyky* were not the only wandering musicians in the Ukrainian countryside. Up to collectivization, and in a limited fashion still after World War Two, there were other groups of wandering or traveling musicians.[47] Some were blind; some were not. A few were probably homeless beggars, while most had homes to which they periodically returned, as with almost all of the minstrels.[48] Some had a repertory similar to that of the blind minstrels, only without instrumental accompaniment.[49] Many, and perhaps most, were women who sang unaccompanied. Their preferred performance contexts were next to churches or monasteries, although they also performed in market squares and wandered among village houses. Some sang in groups of three or more women.[50] Others sang solo or in duet, or more rarely with a man or men.[51] Their repertory consisted mostly of a "begging song," versions of *psal'my*, *zhalisni pisni* (laments) such as *"Syrotyna"* ("The Orphan"), as well as songs derived from the liturgy.[52] There were individual women, usually blind, who wandered with a man—a *lirnyk*,

kobzar, or other blind man. These were frequently married couples. Often both sang, sometimes in duet, sometimes in alternating solo performances.[53] In addition, there were itinerant musicians who played fiddle and sang *psal'my*, about whom little is known.[54] Finally, since the early twentieth century, but especially from the 1920s, there were traveling blind harmonia *(harmoniia)* musicians who performed *psal'my* as well as other genres.[55] In addition to substituting the harmonia for the *lira*, many of them seem not to have continued such peasant performance practices as the vocal recitative and the instrumental drone.[56]

In most regions, all wandering musicians in general, including blind minstrels, were collectively known to villagers as *startsi*. It seems, however, that the blind minstrels, the *kobzari* and *lirnyky*, were regarded by many, and regarded themselves, as different from the other *startsi*. Among many villagers, the minstrels held a higher status than other *startsi*, and were more respected, with a unique place in the rural social hierarchy.[57] This, however, is only a generalization. The minstrels and other *startsi* were not uniformly respected. A certain percentage of the village population was apathetic, or in some cases even hostile to them and their music practices.[58] There are descriptions in the ethnographic literature of minstrels being beaten by villagers.[59] Regarding their self-image, several minstrels from the nineteenth century said that their blindness was "an act of God" and a command to preach Christian teachings among the people. This applied to both *kobzari* and *lirnyky*.[60] This is compelling evidence as to why the minstrels held their prayers and *psal'my* in such high esteem. That these elements were in such demand among the people seems to testify to the effectiveness of the Christian content of the minstrels' art.

One important aspect of the economic status of the blind minstrels is that the learning process was paid for, and they chose and regulated their own students and controlled the learning process in general. Parts of the ethnographic literature describe loose regional organizations that in some locales may have resembled guilds and in others were closely tied to large "schools" of minstrels, primarily among the *lirnyky*. These organizations do not appear to have been brotherhoods directly attached to a church, although there is evidence that some of them kept candles lit before chosen icons in particular churches.[61] In most locales there seems to have been no set hierarchy. In some regions, dues might have been paid. However, regarding hierarchy, dues, and discipline, as well as many other matters, the ethnographic literature is self-contradictory or unclear. Part of the confusion results from the fact that most of the research on the regional organizations was conducted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when most researchers of the time believed *a priori* that these organizations had previously been stronger. This assumption significantly colored their research. The case suggesting that such organizations had been stronger in the past and had declined through time is not convincing, being based largely on the reminiscences of a few elderly minstrels as well as highly questionable and unreliable written sources.[62] In any case, in the 1903 survey of Kiev gubernia, no such organizations were

found, and in the 1890s they apparently did not exist in much of western Podillia.[63] Where these organizations are discussed in the ethnographic literature, there usually does not seem to have been a centralized authority; rather, they were regionally based. Membership was by invitation only, and the first and foremost membership qualification in most cases was to be blind.

The peasant minstrels, and probably their regional organizations, were spread over a large area— using current borders, over virtually all of Ukraine (perhaps excepting some Carpathian regions), most of Belarus, parts of southern Russia (e.g., Kursk, Ostrogozhsk, Belgorod, Briansk, Orël, and other counties bordering Ukraine and Belarus), as well as the Kuban′ and eastern Poland.[64] *Lirnyky* were found in all regions, but *kobzari* only in central and eastern Ukraine, especially in the Left Bank regions of Poltava, Chernihiv, and Kharkiv. The minstrels had secret names for their members, a kind of secret language, and certain performance requirements for students, although the latter were not well defined and seem to have varied considerably from master to master.[65]

Blind boys or young blind men, ranging in age from about six to about thirty (but most often from ten to twenty), served an apprenticeship or learned as paying pupils under a master minstrel for periods ranging from a few days to six years, although most seem to have studied for one or two years. During this time they performed, but their earnings went to their master. Many pupils had more than one master, leaving one and going to another two, three or more times.[66] The ethnographic literature contains a few descriptions of a "graduating" ritual granting permission to perform as an independent master, although it is unclear whether this ritual was widespread or rare.[67] Evidently not all, but perhaps only a minority of performers, went through this ritual. Only the minstrels and their pupils were allowed by custom to play the *kobza* and *lira*.[68] No one else in the village did so. That these instruments were reserved for blind village males is not an unusual occurrence, when viewed in comparison with other parts of the world. In Japan and western India, for example, blind musicians performing a plucked lute and singing epics or religious songs are common, or were until the early twentieth century. Indeed, certain repertory and instruments were reserved only for them. Blind musicians of various types are common in many parts of the world. This topic is too broad, however, to be considered further here.

In teaching a pupil to play one of the two instruments, the *kobza* or the *lira*, the teacher generally laid his hands on those of the pupil, demonstrating the technique by tactile example.[69] Pupils learned prayers and "begging" texts known to all *startsi*, usually rendered in a recitative. In addition, they learned the repertory as well as the "secret language" or jargon, and a kind of moral code by which minstrels were trained to live in an upright manner.[70] The code of conduct seems to have been especially important in the relationship between master and pupil, even though sometimes the code was loosely maintained. Among some of the minstrels the code of conduct was apparently observed mostly in the breach, according to interviews with some of them in the historical ethnographic literature.

There are descriptions of minstrels who were drunkards, or who were cruel to their pupils and beat them.[71] Regardless of whether they could live up to the high standards in their own lives, however, a projection of the image of moral authority seems to have been a significant part of being a minstrel, both in terms of their repertory and in their public lives. A large percentage of the public expected minstrels to observe high moral standards and lead extraordinary lives.[72] The minstrels seem to have often tried to hide their daily lives—and their human weaknesses, especially for alcohol—from other villagers, perhaps to reinforce the image of being among "God's chosen."[73]

TRANSFORMATIONS OF MINSTREL PERFORMANCE PRACTICES FROM THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY THROUGH THE 1930s

The social role and economic status of the village minstrels, like any other elements of culture, were not static. It is a spurious, if widespread notion that peasant culture of the nineteenth century was part of an unbroken chain, with no fluctuations and no changes, that stretched far back into time. Documenting specific changes in that culture is difficult, however, because of a lack of reliable data. There is insufficient ethnographic data to discuss changes in the expressive culture of the village minstrels before the mid-nineteenth century in more than a general way. There are dozens of ethnographic sources that can be utilized for the period after mid-century. A full generation before the establishment of the Soviet state, the role and status of the blind minstrels were undergoing numerous changes, partly as a result of normal rural developments similar to those occurring over most of Eastern Europe at that time, and partly as a result of steadily increasing contact between village minstrels and urban researchers. This contact would alter the perception among the intelligentsia of rural music practice, and it was their altered perception that eventually would become the standard view found in popular Ukrainian culture about the music of the blind minstrels—a view that became so widely accepted that it impacts on national identity even today.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, urban intellectuals took a keen interest in the minstrels, either as what they thought of as living anachronisms (a common interest among Russian intellectuals), or as carriers of national (read: Ukrainian) culture. Several urban researchers journeyed to the villages to transcribe the texts of their repertory and write their biographies. Some of them stayed and lived with the musicians in the villages for long periods of time, even studying under them. The artist Lev Zhemchuzhnikov wandered the countryside of the Left Bank in the 1850s, as did Panteleimon Kulish. Another artist, Opanas Slastion, studied with *kobzari* in the Poltava region and journeyed frequently to the Chernihiv region and less often to the Kharkiv region, from the 1870s to the early twentieth century. Yet a third artist, Porfyrii Martynovych, lived for long periods

in villages in the Poltava region between the 1860s and the early years of the twentieth century—more than forty years. In addition, some Ukrainian intellectuals brought selected minstrels to cities to perform on stage or to live with them for periods of time. For example, the Ukrainian composer Mykola Lysenko brought the *kobzari* Ostap Veresai, Terentii Parkhomenko, and others.[74] In 1908 Lesia Ukraïnka and her husband, the ethnomusicologist Klyment Kvitka, brought the *kobzar* Hnat Honcharenko from the Kharkiv region to live with them while they recorded his performances at their home on wax cylinders.[75] At the twelfth meeting of the South-Western Imperial Archeological Society in Kharkiv in 1902, the writer and cultural activist Hnat Khotkevych organized concerts of Ukrainian minstrels and other village musicians for the scholars gathered at the conference. Tours took place in the late nineteenth century and especially in the early twentieth century of Ukrainian and Russian cities, during which minstrels and other village musicians performed on stage for large numbers of people.[76]

One result of this contact was the development of a sharp division, both in the kinds of audiences who patronized the art of the minstrels, and in the concomitant types of repertory found in this division. For the overwhelming majority of the minstrels, there remained primarily or even only the peasant audience of long standing, which preferred *psal'my* and satirical songs. On the other hand, a very small number of minstrels found that they could dramatically increase their earnings by playing to the desires and the requests of the Ukrainian patriotic intelligentsia. It was especially such people who selected certain *kobzari* (rarely *lirnyky*) and brought them to urban areas and to stages on which to perform. To the selected few, they paid large (by village standards) sums of money to perform in concert what they wanted to hear, namely, the heroic epics. This division in the audience, repertory, and economic status among minstrels can be said to have begun in a rudimentary fashion in the 1860s, when Panteleimon Kulish began sending money to the *kobzar* Ostap Veresai.[77] The most significant influence of the intelligentsia on the performance practices of the minstrels, however, occurred roughly between the 1880s and World War I, when ethnographers, folklorists, and members of the (mostly urban) Ukrainian intelligentsia singled out for special patronage a few *kobzari* who consciously altered their performance practices in order to curry the favor of the *pany* (wealthy or educated members of the elite) and thus earn more money. The ethnographer Krist notes that around 1900, the *kobzar* Ostap Butenko performed *dumy* primarily for *pany* because they paid more for this genre. Horlenko was told much the same by the *kobzar* Ivan Kriukovs'kyi in the 1880s.[78] Still other *kobzari* purposely learned texts of *dumy* which they had likely never heard before from books or from members of the intelligentsia and set these texts to music. Mykola Lysenko, Hnat Khotkevych, and Opanas Slastion are a few of the Ukrainian elite who figured prominently in this process.[79]

The most glaring example of this influence—or put another way, the most successful entrepreneur among the blind minstrels—was Terentii Parkhomenko of the Chernihiv region. He told the ethnographer Sperans'kyi that in the 1890s he

earned about 200 rubles a year, on the high side of the usual income for village minstrels, which I estimate to have been between 50 and 200 rubles a year. By 1903, however, he claimed to have been earning up to 600 rubles a year, a large sum for a villager of the time.[80] He had learned only two or three *dumy* from his teachers (oral practice), but had purposely learned another seven or eight *dumy* from books or from members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia. He was candid in his explanation of why he did so—it was to increase his earnings. He was evidently successful, as the intelligentsia brought him to urban concert stages and to their homes to perform, far from the performance contexts of the village. They were not particularly interested in hearing *psal'my* or satirical songs, but rather the texts on Cossack themes.

One can easily understand the reasons both sides (listeners and performers) had for engaging in this activity. The elite consumers of *dumy* (the intelligentsia) needed *dumy* performers to confirm their vision of the Cossack-Ukrainian past. The peasant performers of *dumy* (the *kobzari*), in order to increase their earnings, needed to learn material that did not then exist in their oral practice. Of course, this situation was not unique to Ukraine. National cultural norms in nearly every region of Europe were constructed by specific people who altered peasant cultural norms, absorbing some, destroying others, and placing these norms on a dynamic axis between nation and region.[81]

Stated another way, some of the changes in repertory and economic status of rural minstrels of the time were partly due to the influence of educated Ukrainians and their interest in creating urban-rural links, especially in expressive culture, that could be seen as elements of a greater Ukrainian culture shared by all. In Ukraine, as in other parts of Europe in the nineteenth century, national activists used elements of peasant culture as vehicles for creating and institutionalizing national networks in which a formerly regional cultural element was transformed into a national cultural element.[82] For example, when Hnat Khotkevych began his school of bandura performance in the first decade of the twentieth century, the teachings were aimed primarily at young Ukrainian cultural activists. It can be said that he was trying to create a new category of performance, one based partly on village music and partly on urban composed genres. His idea was apparently to expand the numbers of people who participated in what could become a national, instead of a village or regional, music practice. The participants in his school were sighted, and most were of urban origin. Until the advent of Soviet power, they learned a repertory that was varied and included all of the music genres of the blind minstrels, including the *psal'my* and other religious genres as well as *dumy*. In addition, it included an urban practice—music that was written out in notation, for the most part original compositions of Khotkevych and other participants.[83] Such schools seem to have had little or no effect, however, on the performance practices of most blind peasant minstrels, who continued to perform their mixed repertory of religious and satirical songs, with the occasional minstrel also knowing a smattering of a heroic epic or two. This division in repertory and audience that was

characterized by, among other things, an urban-rural or elite-peasant differentiation, continued for several decades. Most peasant-born blind minstrels seldom or never took part in the largely urban practices of the formally schooled elite. This remained true for many minstrels even after Soviet power had changed the demographic composition, ideology, aims, and methods of influence of the elite group.

The Khotkevych schools marked the beginning of a movement that would grow to enormous proportions, the development of what can be called "national bandurists."[84] In the Soviet period the Khotkevych ensembles and ideas were transformed into another vehicle. By the late 1920s, the repertory of these national bandurists had changed drastically. Virtually all *psal'my* and other religious elements were gone, as were many of the *dumy*. They were replaced with bland arrangements of folk songs, music by Soviet composers, and revolutionary songs.[85] In addition, there was a concerted effort to turn the bandura into a conservatory concert instrument on which one could play the music of Bach, Beethoven, and the repertory of European classical composers. This secularized repertory, but in particular the arrangements of folk songs, came to be regarded by urban populations as the real and actual repertory of the *kobzari* and *lirnyky*. Since the 1930s, young students of bandura in Ukraine, North America and elsewhere, usually in ensembles or conservatories, learn only this secularized repertory, invented in the first decades of the twentieth century, and mistakenly regarded as both quintessentially Ukrainian and a continuation of the longstanding traditions of the village minstrels.

In the 1920s, offshoots of the urban national bandura ensembles appeared among sighted youth in both the village and the city. During the time of wide dispersion of elements and symbols of Ukrainian identity and cultural consciousness that is often referred to as "Ukrainization," hundreds of urban and village bandura ensembles were formed all over Ukraine in which young men and women performed a secularized and standardized repertory.[86] Some toured widely, especially in village clubs, and received payment from attendees at their concerts. In other words, they kept the gate. Their repertory consisted largely of arrangements of what they thought were folk songs. Many of these performers could read music notation. One of the aims of the Soviet authorities in the 1920s was to create a new *kobza* art form, one specific and suitable to socialism, and open to all.[87] They laid emphasis on its potential for mass appeal, but also on its possibilities for developing "ensembles of *kobzar*-Komsomolists" *(kapely kobzariv-komsomol'tsiv)*.[88]

By 1930 a general repression of rural cultural life in Ukraine, including music, was already well under way. The peasant instrumental musicians and the village women specialists were to feel this repression keenly, both in the proscription of religious elements in village rituals and in the regimentation of village music practice by administrative authorities.[89] But a far more drastic repression was

aimed at the blind minstrels and some of their organized counterparts, i.e., those in the touring ensembles of national bandurists.

The blind minstrels were a difficult social group for the administrative authorities to control. In the early 1920s they were ordered by the state to stop traveling and plying their trade on the road. Apparently, administrative officials did not feel that it was dignified to perform on the street in the new world of the Soviet Union. Minstrels were to remain in one village and teach only local inhabitants and those from the outside whom the state would send to them. The students did not have to be blind, as had been the minstrels' (and villagers') usual requirement before Soviet rule. Instead of on the street, performances by the minstrels were to take place on stages in schools and village clubs or other facilities maintained under government auspices.[90] Famous *kobzari* of the 1930s such as Iehor Movchan, Fedir Kushperyk, Pavlo Nosach, and Petro Huz′ rarely performed in village contexts, and were probably under direct supervision of the Party and NKVD at least part of the time. Large-scale performance contexts were arranged for them, such as in factories and for the Red Army. They also performed in concerts at universities, houses of culture, Young Pioneer and Komsomol clubs, and the like.[91]

The extent to which the blind peasant minstrels honored the administrative proscriptions and prescriptions of the state is unknown. Many were probably forced to do so. It seems certain that in a short period of time, there was a decline in whatever private teaching still existed in village practice on a master-pupil basis, radically altering the social organization of this rural music. According to elderly musicians and others with whom I conducted interviews in several regions of the Left Bank, the NKVD actively discouraged private study with minstrels, arresting or threatening with arrest those who practiced this activity. If the minstrels could not travel and could not choose their own students, places of performance, or kinds of teaching materials (i.e., repertory), their lifestyle and musical art would be completely changed, which was likely the aim of the administrative authorities. This can be seen as an effort by the state authorities to control yet another segment of the peasant population, bringing the lives of the minstrels under close supervision, as was happening concurrently in most segments of society at this time. Obviously, these were difficult proscriptions for the minstrels, for honoring them would mean the effective end of the performance practices, repertory, lifestyle, social organization, and economic status of the blind minstrels as well as an end to their historic role as carriers of the cultural symbols found in religious and heroic genres. Certainly by the late 1950s, and in some regions likely by the outbreak of World War II, these control mechanisms had all but obliterated the minstrels' distinct social role. Their art and social role were intertwined, and changing the one transformed the other.

It seems likely that these proscriptions reduced the unique moral authority of the minstrels. It nearly totally altered their economic status. They had earlier derived much of their authority from the fact that they were not locals, but

occasional visitors with uncommon performance practices, whose words and deeds exhorted all who heard them to lead the good life according to the commands of God and Church as well as custom. They alone were able to perform on certain instruments and a certain repertory. They had been further set apart by their blindness and gender-specific exclusivity, their "secret language," and selective master-pupil teaching methods. Their longstanding social role was nearly destroyed by the prescription of the state-sanctioned secularized repertory and performance practices, which required no distinctiveness of person, gender, place, time, or context and could be performed by anyone, anytime, anywhere. The aim seems to have been to transform the peasant minstrels into "national" (read: Soviet) bandurists who were to practice a specific kind of music under strict state control.

The peasant minstrels largely had been economically independent of state concerns and had practiced their art according to longstanding village economic norms. The prohibitions on travel, street performance, and paid teaching of pupils of their choice destroyed any economic independence they might once have had. Required to become a part of the socialist economy as stage performers, they became almost totally dependent on the state for any income earned from musical activities. Even if it did not mean arrest, resistance by an individual minstrel meant loss of income by ending or limiting his public musical performances. Living under such threats and restrictions, he often no longer had a reason or an opportunity to continue practicing the longstanding repertory.

According to interviews with surviving relatives of blind minstrels that I conducted in several regions of Ukraine, in the early 1930s many of the blind minstrels had not complied with the order to stop traveling, and were still traveling at least part of the time. Their continuation of longstanding patterns was apparently viewed with alarm in the administrative organs of the Soviet state. One result may have been physical threats. Several articles have appeared in the Ukrainian press over the last few years discussing what is described as a gathering of blind minstrels in Kharkiv in 1934 (or 1937), sponsored by the state.[92] According to the story as developed in these articles, about 230 of the blind minstrels disappeared during this gathering, presumably arrested or shot. However, this matter needs to be approached cautiously. Although it is of course entirely possible that this gathering took place, I am not aware of reliable documentation that conclusively shows this to be true. In addition to consulting archival sources, I have interviewed relatives of village minstrels and *startsi* of the time. No archival information has emerged. More important, no one from these families claims to know anything about such a gathering. Research on this matter continues. In any case, it seems certain that large numbers of minstrels were repressed over the period from the 1920s to the early 1950s. If we consider that in the early 1900s there were more than two thousand, and likely three thousand blind minstrels (or even twice that many), the fact that there were only a handful by 1950 does not seem plausible without the negative intervention of the state, including arrest and/or execution.

One can only speculate about how the lives of blind minstrels and other *startsi* were affected by the famine of 1932–33 in central and eastern Ukraine, and the famine of 1947 in several regions including most of western Ukraine. Blind minstrels and other *startsi* made a large part of their living by wandering rural roads, which became clogged with many others during the famines. The minstrels' normally fragile economic base would have been totally shattered at such times. Millions competed for small amounts of food, and part of this competition took place on village roads in the form of begging. Minstrels and other *startsi,* as well as the blind and crippled in general, were probably among the most likely to have perished in large numbers at such times.

The touring ensembles of national bandurists in the 1930s were also having their performance practices proscribed, and many performers were under physical threat as well. I have interviewed elderly relatives of especially village ensemble members who describe how many of these performers, and in some cases whole ensembles, were arrested and disappeared.[93]

To answer the question of why the repression of musical life in Ukraine took place, one can of course proceed from the assumption of a general repression by the Communist authorities of Ukrainian culture, and especially of rural civil society. With the regimentation of rural life came the destruction of many unique peasant cultural norms of long standing. The repression of the blind minstrels can be seen in the broader context of the effort to destroy those cultural elements that were still a part of a distinct peasant society. The blind minstrels were an uncontrollable source of moral authority in the village, and direct competition for a totalitarian state. The bulk of their repertory consisted of genres that included both religious and national symbols, neither of which were tolerable to the organs of power. The minstrels were a self-governing and autonomous social group within peasant society. The group chose whom to admit, how to train them, and how they should live. In addition, they traveled widely. These activities were apparently unacceptable to the state power and control then still being built.

The other group of performers, the national bandurists, can be seen as part of the rising tide of national consciousness. Many in both groups, minstrels and national bandurists, died as a result of the repression of specific aspects of Ukrainian culture and civil society. Aside from this similarity, it is useful to note significant differences in the social roles, economic status, and fate of the blind minstrels and the national bandurists. The performance practices of the peasant minstrels were specific to a small group of people (blind village males) and were almost entirely orally transmitted. They were also specific to a certain cultural milieu. As that milieu began to disappear with collectivization and the forced socialization of virtually all kinds of village cultural life, the minstrels' role as a moralizing influence probably decreased greatly. The national bandurists, on the other hand, were drawn from the population at large. Their repertory (secular), their musical instrument (bandura), and their performance practices (including notated music) were, like any other non-context-specific (or popular) repertory

and mass-produced instrument, accessible to virtually anyone who wished to learn or purchase them. The national cultures constructed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in most parts of the world were, and remain today, a part of vast consumer markets readily available to anyone with even a modicum of purchasing power. Although hundreds of national bandurists were arrested in the Stalinist period, there were always more to take their place. One had merely to purchase an instrument in a store in order to begin to take part in the national music culture. Not so with the blind minstrels. Their instrument and performance practices, their social role and economic status, their art—in fact their existence—were imbedded in peasant society, in a cultural fabric that had developed over hundreds of years. When the peasant social structure and its cultural fabric were drastically altered, the blind minstrels disappeared. Once they were gone, they were gone forever.

CONCLUSION

Today, the blind minstrels of the Ukrainian countryside no longer exist. Thousands of bandura performers play a secular and standardized repertory in a style that is perhaps best described as urban in nature, derived from the musical techniques, forms, genres, and styles of twentieth-century urban popular music, including Soviet music genres and styles, as well as older art music of the European elite. They are far removed from the music practices of the blind peasant minstrels. The actual performance practices of the *kobzari* and *lirnyky* are no longer carried by most of today's bandurists, whose economic status as performers is entirely different from that of the minstrels. These bandurists either depend largely on salaried positions in conservatories and music schools, or perform as part-time amateurs. While these differences are obviously significant in an evaluation of current practice, so is a similarity, namely an echo of the former social role of the minstrels. Some contemporary bandurists proudly compare a perceived role as national poets with the moralizing role of the blind minstrels, even while ignoring the fact that their instrument, repertory, and style of performance have virtually nothing in common with the music practices of the *kobzari* and *lirnyky*. Furthermore, films, books, and the plastic arts in Ukraine today, as in the recent past, often include the symbol of the *kobzar* as moral authority. This is not only because of Taras Shevchenko's *Kobzar*, nor is it merely a poetic symbol. It is also testimony to the power carried by the blind peasant minstrels, as well as to the former significance of their role in the civil society of the village. Decades after the demise of the blind peasant minstrels, their moral authority still holds sway over Ukrainian consciousness.

Tchaikovsky Music Conservatory, Kiev

NOTES

1. V. Domanyts'kyi, "Kobzari i lirniki Kievskoi gubernii v 1903 godu," in *Pamiatnaia kniga na 1904 g.*, pt. 4 (Kiev: Izdatelstvo Kievskogo gubernskogo komiteta, 1904). This article and the survey are reviewed in N. O. Sumtsov, "Sovremennoe izuchenie kobzarstva," *Sbornik Khar'kovskogo istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva* 16 (1905): 273 [=Trudy Khar'kovskoi kommissii po ustroistvu XIII Arkheologicheskogo s"ezda].

2. Hnat Khotkevych, "Neskol'ko slov ob ukrainskikh banduristakh i lirnikakh," *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 2 (1903).

3. For comments on these figures see Sumtsov, 274.

4. Khotkevych, 101.

5. Porfyrii Martynovych, Instytut mystetstvoznavstva, fol'klorystyky ta etnolohiï im. Ryl's'koho (IMFE)(Kiev) fond 8–4, od. zb. 310, ark. 13. From his description, not all of these may have been *kobzari* and *lirnyky*, but other wandering singers as well.

6. Using very rough (and I believe low) estimates, I take Domanyts'kyi (1904) and Martynovych (fond 8–4) as a reference point and assume at least 300 minstrels per region in these regions: Kharkiv, Poltava, Chernihiv, Kiev (including central Polissia), Eastern Podillia, Western Podillia, Volhynia (including western Polissia), and L'viv; plus a smattering from Bukovyna as well as southern and southeastern regions contiguous to the Black Sea (a guess of 100 in each, total 300): 300 x 8 = 2,400 + 300 = 2,700 minstrels in Ukraine in the early twentieth century. This I regard as the very lowest possible estimate, with twice that number a possibility. If most of Belarus, plus those Polish and Russian counties (current borders) contiguous to Ukraine are added to this figure, the low total would be approximately 4,000.

7. Opanas Slastion, "Kobzar Mykhailo Kravchenko i ego dumy," reprinted from *Kievskaia starina*, May 1902, p. 15. Projecting his estimates for the one region onto all of Ukrainian territory, the number of blind minstrels in Ukraine at that time would be approximately 25,000 (3,000 x 8 + 1,000), probably an unlikely and inflated figure.

8. I have conducted fieldwork in several regions of Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland (1980–83 and 1989) and Ukraine (1989–95), with shorter research trips to Moldova, Slovakia, and Belarus. Research in Ukraine has been made possible by several organizations, including IREX (in 1989–90), with funds provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the United States Information Agency, and the USSR, Ukrainian, and Moldovan Academies of Sciences. Research in 1993–94 was made possible in part by IREX (Special Projects Grant) and in 1993–96 by a Fulbright Fellowship. For two months in 1991, support was provided by the Smithsonian Institution, Office of Folklife Programs. For shorter periods of research (four trips between 1990 and 1992), funds were provided by the Ukrainian Studies Fund and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. In summer 1992, research was supported in part by the Ryl's'kyi Institute of Art, Folkloristics and Ethnology of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (IMFE). None of these organizations is responsible for the views expressed in this article.

9. For succinct, but wholly uncritical, summaries of many of the historical sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries concerning performers and repertory, see Sofiia Hrytsa, "Pro styl'ovi nasharuvannia v muzytsi dum," *Ukraïns'ke muzykoznavstvo* 6 (1971): 15–20; idem, *Melos ukraïns'koï narodnoï epiky* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1979), 52–59.

10. For a more detailed description of farmer-musicians in Eastern Europe see William Noll, "Economics of Music Patronage among Polish and Ukrainian Peasants to 1939," *Ethnomusicology* 35/3 (1991): 349–79.

11. Panteleimon Kulish, *Zapiski o iuzhnoi Rusi* (St. Petersburg, 1856) 1:44; M. Sperans'kyi, "Iuzhno-russkaia pesnia i sovremennye eë nositeli," *Sbornik istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva pri institute kn. Bezborodko v Nezhine* 9 (1904): 11; Oleksander Malynka, "Kobzari S. Vlasko ta D. Symonenko i lirnyk A. Ivanyts'kyi; ikhnii repertuar," *Pervisne hromadianstvo ta ioho perezhytky na Ukraïni* 1 (1929): 105–107; Dmytro Revuts'kyi et al., "Kobzari i lirnyky," *Etnohrafichnyi visnyk* 3

(1927): 64; Volodymyr Kharkiv, "Posterezhennia nad lirnykamy ta kobzariamy Balkivs'koho raionu na Kharkivshchyni," IMFE fond 6–2, od. zb. 23 (2), 1929, ark. 50–51.

12. Probably the most detailed description of a *khram* in the ethnographic literature is Valerian Borzhkovs'kyi, "Lirniki," *Kievskaia starina,* September 1889, pp. 661–704.

13. A widespread misunderstanding, especially prominent among Soviet scholars, is the claim that the blind minstrels wandered village roads only in the warm months, from after Easter to October or November. Although various ethnographic sources indicate that this was so for some minstrels, several other sources claim the opposite, that at least some minstrels wandered in the cold months from autumn to Easter, because in these months villagers had plenty of bread, while in the spring and summer months they were less likely to have surplus bread or grain to give away (e.g., V. P. Horlenko, "Kobzari i lirniki," *Kievskaia starina,* December 1884, p. 655; Borzhkovs'kyi, 654; I. Krist, "Kobzari i lirniki khar'kovskoi gubernii," *Sbornik Khar'kovskogo istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva* 15, pt. 2 (1902): 127, 129, 130). Still other sources claim that a given minstrel could travel in either cold or warm weather, depending on the fasts, holidays, etc. (especially *khramy)* where they might earn the most money (Sperans'kyi, 26; Horlenko). One likely explanation for this discrepancy in the sources is that some minstrels wandered in the warm, some in the cold months, and still others wandered part of the time in both cold and warm months.

14. A large number of sources illustrate the economic norms of income-producing activities among blind minstrels, e.g., V. P. Horlenko, "Bandurist Ivan Kriukovskii," *Kievskaia starina,* December 1882, p. 486; Horlenko, "Kobzari," 656; Sperans'kyi, 4; Kulish, 44; Slastion, 9; Borzhkovs'kyi, 671; E. Chikalenko, "Lirnik Vasil' Moroz," *Kievskaia starina,* February 1896, p. 79; S. Maslov, "Lirniki Poltavskoi i Chernigovskoi gubernii," *Sbornik Khar'kovskogo istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva* 13 (1902): 219; Domanyts'kyi.

15. Kost' Koperzhyns'kyi, "Kalendar narodn'oï obriadovosty novorichnoho tsyklu," *Pervisne hromadianstvo ta ioho perezhytky na Ukraïni* 3 (1929): 14–98. These gatherings were still common in many regions after World War II, based on interviews I conducted in Volhynia, Podillia, and the Cherkasy and Kharkiv regions.

16. Fedir Kolomyichenko, "Sil's'ki zabavy v Chernyhivshchyni," *Materiialy do ukraïns'koï etnol'ohiï* 18 (1918): 123–41.

17. Some of the sources describing these attitudes are: Hnat Khotkevych, *Muzychni instrumenty ukraïns'koho narodu* (Kharkiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukraïny, 1930), 27; Volodymyr Hnatiuk, "Znadoby do ukraïns'koï demonol'ohiï," *Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk* 15 (1904): 8–10; and Pavlo Chubyns'kyi, *Trudy etnograficheskо-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii v Zapadno-russkii krai* (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennoe russkoe geograficheskoe obshchestvo, 1877), 2:364.

18. See Noll, 355–57.

19. The women music specialists of the wedding sequence are described in Petro Kolomyichenko, "Vesilie v seli Prokhorakh, Borzens'koho povitu, Chernyhivs'koï huberniï," *Materiialy do ukraïns'koï etnol'ohiï* 19–20 (1919): 81; and O. A. Pravdiuk and M. M. Shubravs'ka, *Vesillia* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1970), 1:33. There are dozens of ethnographic sources documenting the extreme complexities of the peasant wedding sequence in Eastern Europe. One of the most detailed of these is Pavlo Chubyns'kyi, *Trudy etnograficheskо-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii v Zapadno-russkii krai,* vol. 4 (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennoe russkoe geograficheskoe obshchestvo, 1877). It includes 138 melodies transcribed by Mykola Lysenko.

20. For a more detailed examination of the role of women in the musical life of the village see William Noll, "Rol' zhinok v muzychnomu zhytti ukraïns'koho sela," *Rodovid* 9 (1994): 36–43.

21. Kharkiv, ark. 52.

22. See, among many others, Kulish, 45; Maslov, 9; Hnatiuk, 6.

23. A shorter and different version of this section appeared in Ukrainian as William Noll, "Moral'nyi avtorytet ta suspil'na rol' slipykh bardiv v Ukraïni," *Rodovid* 6 (1993): 16–26.

24. Many of the *psal'my* texts in the repertory of the minstrels were of literary (written) origin. However, the minstrels were blind, Braille was virtually unknown among them, and when they learned a text from a book, it was read to them. Then they taught it to their students by rote, by oral method,

altering it according to their personal style. In considering this process, one may ask when a book-derived text becomes a part of oral practice, if ever, and whether this question is even important. This problem applies both to *psal'my* and *dumy* texts learned by minstrels from books read aloud to them. I will leave the issue aside, as it requires an involved discussion.

25. Among publications that include prayers collected from village performers are the following: P. Bezsonov, *Kaleki perekhozhie. Sbornik stikhov i issledovanie,* 6 vols. (Moscow, 1861–64), and Volodymyr Hnatiuk, "Lirnyky," *Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk* 2 (1896): 18–25. Both of these publications are primarily concerned with *psal'my* texts. Other published sources with *psal'my* texts include A. Malynka, "Lirnik Ievdokim Mikitovich Mokroviz," *Kievskaia starina,* September 1894, pp. 434–44; Krist, 121–33; Horlenko, "Kobzari i lirniki," 21–50; Horlenko, "Tri psal'my," *Kievskaia starina* 1–4 (1883): 467–71; Sperans'kyi; and Slastion. Some of the largest and most significant sources on *psal'my* texts are as yet unpublished, namely, the manuscripts of Porfyrii Martynovych, e.g., IMFE, fond 11–4, od. zb. 564, 592, 596, 674, 699, as well as many other documents in the Martynovych collection. Another unpublished and extensive source is Volodymyr Kharkiv, IMFE, fond 6–4, od. zb. 161/3, "Dumy i psal'my," 1930.

26. The largest published collection of music notation of *psal'my* as performed by minstrels is P. Demuts'kyi, *Lira i eë motivy* (Kiev: Leon Idzikovskii, 1903). It contains fifty-two melodies with texts. This study is seriously flawed in that the melodies are not transcriptions, but compilations, each melody a composite of various performances. More valuable are transcriptions of *psal'my* made from wax cylinder recordings (and thus from a single performance) in the unpublished manuscripts of Volodymyr Kharkiv, IMFE fond 6–4, od. zb. 194, "Dumy, psal'my (z melodiiamy)," 1930, 90 ark. These wax cylinder recordings are stored in Kiev at IMFE. Among other, less extensive notated sources, are Speran'skyi; Stanislav Liudkevych, "Halyts'ko-rus'ki narodni melodiï" (pt. 2), *Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk* 22 (1908): 307–12; and Borys Luhovs'kyi, "Psal'my, 1921–1924," IMFE fond 6–4, od. zb. 136. A more recent transcription of a *lirnyk* was made by the Belarusian ethnomusicologist I. D. Nazina from a recording made in 1969 of a minstrel born in 1898: I. D. Nazina, *Belaruskaia narodnaia instrumental'naia muzyka* (Minsk: Navuka i tekhnika, 1989), 203–205 (i.e., no. 143, "Prytcha pra bludnaha syna").

27. A typical example of this literature is Maslov, 217–26.

28. Kulish, 45; Sperans'kyi; and Kateryna Hrushevs'ka, *Ukraïns'ki narodni dumy* (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukraïny, 1927) 1:xiv. These words or terms may have included *moralyzyruiushchi shtykhy* (moralizing verses) in one part of the Poltava region in the 1880s (Horlenko, "Kobzari," 27).

29. Kharkiv, ark. 52.

30. Slastion, 13.

31. Horlenko, "Kobzari," 656; Kharkiv, ark. 68–69; Borys Luhovs'kyi, "Chernihivs'ki startsi," *Pervisne hromadianstvo ta ioho perezhytky na Ukraïni* 3 (1926): 131–77; Malynka, "Kobzari S. Vlasko ta D. Symonenko," 128.

32. Slastion, 6.

33. A. N. Malynka, "Kobzari i lirniki. Terentii Parkhomenko, Nikifor Dudka i Aleksei Pobegailo," *Zemskii sbornik Chernigovskoi gubernii* 4 (1903): 68; P. E. Petrov, "K repertuaram lirnikov," *Sbornik Istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva pri institute kn. Bezborodko v Nezhine* 9 (1914): 6; Slastion, 7–8.

34. Khotkevych, 94.

35. Malynka, "Kobzari i lirnyky," 68; Slastion, 10–12; Khotkevych, 94; Sperans'kyi, 12–13.

36. Hrushevs'ka, xvii.

37. Speran'skyi, 33.

38. Kharkiv, ark. 52.

39. Music characteristics of both *psal'my* and *dumy* as performed by many of the blind minstrels include musical scales with flated thirds and raised fourths, recitative, tempo rubato, a sometimes melismatic vocal rendition, and a formal practice of alternating vocal recitative with instrumental interludes.

40. Cf. Horlenko, "Tri psal'my," 468.

41. One of the earliest examples of this is Prince Tsertelev, "O narodnykh stikhotvoreniiakh (Pis'mo ko g-nu Maksimovichu)," *Vestnik Evropy* 9 (1827): 270–77.

42. For an earlier criticism of this practice by a Ukrainian scholar see Hrushevs'ka, xvi–xvii, cii, and cviii. See also her "Z etnohrafichnoï pratsi 1880-x rokiv," *Naukovyi zbirnyk* 32 (1929): 136–38.

43. This problem was rarely discussed or even noticed in the past. Among the few to do so were Sperans'kyi, "Iuzhno-russkaia pesnia," 5, and Horlenko, "Tri psal'my," 467.

44. Roksoliana Zalies'ka and Anatolii Ivanyts'kyi, eds., "Lystuvannia Klymenta Kvitky i Filareta Kolessy," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni T. Shevchenka* (L'viv) 223 (1992): 318 [= Pratsi Sektsiï etnohrafiï ta fol'klorystyky]. Kvitka suggests in this letter that if Kolessa wishes also to record *psal'my*, he should seek additional funding for this purpose from the Shevchenko Scientific Society in L'viv.

45. Several approaches to oral practice have been developed over the last thirty years which are applicable to problems in Ukrainian village music performance, although such approaches so far have not been activated by most scholars in Ukrainian studies. Among many others these include the approaches used in the following works: Albert Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960); Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969); Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition As History* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); Gerard Behague, ed., *Performance Practice: Ethnomusicological Perspectives* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984); and *Powerhouse for God*, a 16 mm, 1-hour color documentary film directed by Barry Dornfeld, Tom Rankin, and Jeff Todd Titon. Distributed by Documentary Educational Resources, 101 Morse St., Watertown, Mass., 1989.

46. Significant music transcriptions of blind minstrels were published before the Soviet period. For transcriptions of the *psal'my* and religious genres, see above. The number of transcriptions of *dumy* is too long to list here. Two of the most significant researchers were Mykola Lysenko, *Narodni muzychni instrumenty na Ukraïni* (originally published in *Zoria* 1/1–4 [1894], reprinted Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1955) and Filaret Kolessa, *Melodiï ukrains'kykh narodnykh dum* (originally published in *Materialy do ukraïns'koï etnol'ohiï* 13 and 14 [1910 and 1913], reprinted Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1969).

47. Among the early references to these musicians are: Kulish, 44–47; Bezsonov; and Martynovych, fond 8–4, od. zb. 310, ark. 13.

48. Luhovs'kyi, "Chernihivs'ki startsi"; Borys Luhovs'kyi, "Materiialy do iarmarkovoho repertuaru ta pobutu startsivstva v zakhidnii Chernihivshchyni," *Rodovid* 6 (1993): 87–120.

49. Malynka, "Kobzari S. Vlasko ta D. Symonenko," 123; Kharkiv, ark. 53.

50. Horlenko, "Kobzari," 24; F. Bakhtyns'kyi, "Kyïvs'ki vulychni spivtsi," *Muzyka* 11–12 (1925): 434–35.

51. Luhovs'kyi, "Chernihivs'ki startsi," 147–50.

52. Virtually all the blind minstrels as well as most of the other wandering singers utilized a "begging song" or a "beggars' recitation" to ask for assistance. This aspect of their repertory varied from performer to performer, and from one performance to another for any one performer. For texts of "begging songs" see Luhovs'kyi, "Chernihivs'ki startsi," 162–63, 170–71, and Borys Luhovs'kyi, "Materiialy," 101–103. See also Horlenko, "Kobzari," 655, and Borzhkovs'kyi, 655, 660–61. For one of the few music transcriptions of this genre see Mykhailo Haidai, "Zhebrats'ki retsytatsiï," *Etnohrafichnyi visnyk* 6 (1928): 85. Information regarding this aspect of the repertory is also based on interviews I conducted in villages in the Chernihiv and Kharkiv regions and in Volhynia, the Cherkasy region, and Podillia.

53. Petrov, 7; Maslov, 1.

54. Pavel Tikhovskii, "Kobzari Khar'kovskoi gubernii," *Sbornik Khar'kovskogo istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva* 13 (1902): 138. As the author describes this performance practice, the fiddler played a drone on open strings, much like the sound of a *lira*, and sang the melody over this. Fiddle-playing *psal'my* singers are also described in Petrov, 4. Based on interviews I conducted in villages in Volhynia, Podillia, and the Cherkasy region, a similar practice still existed there (and likely in other regions) after World War II.

55. Kharkiv, ark. 55; Luhovs'kyi, "Chernihivs'ki startsi," 152.

56. Although these blind *harmoniia* musicians were still quite prominent in some regions in the 1950s, and perhaps even later (especially in Volhynia, based on inteviews I conducted there), little is known about them, as Soviet fieldworkers of the time apparently did not conduct systematic research among them. Photographs of such musicians in Volhynia in the 1930s are held in the Obrębski Archive, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Today, blind *harmoniia* musicians are still working the market squares and village roads in the Kovel' region of western Polissia, based on my fieldwork in the region.

57. Krist, 122; Luhovs'kyi, "Chernihivs'ki startsi," 168; I. F. Tiumenev, "Lirnitskiia pesni," *Vestnik arkheologii i istorii arkheologii* 4 (1885): 40; this is also based on interviews I conducted in villages in the Chernihiv, Kharkiv, Cherkasy regions, Podillia, and Volhynia.

58. Luhovs'kyi, "Chernihivs'ki startsi," 166–69; see also A. A. Rusov, "Ostap Veresai, odin iz poslednikh kobzarei malorusskikh," *Zapiski Iugo-Zapadnogo otdela Russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva* 1 (1874): 313.

59. For example, see Ostap Veresai's description of being beaten, as related by Lev Zhemchuzhnikov, "Poltavshchyna," *Osnova* 10 (1861): 96. In 1911 the *kobzar* Terentii Parkhomenko was beaten to such an extent that he died a few days later; as related to me by his granddaughter, he was beaten by unknown persons in a market square who were apparently unhappy with his performance.

60. Kulish, 45; Sperans'kyi, 28; Maslov, 9; Khotkevych, 87; Rusov, 313.

61. As related by the Chernihiv region *kobzar*, Parkhomenko, in Speransʹkyi, 17.

62. Although frequently cited by some *dumy* scholars, many of these sources seem to have the ring of untruth, even fantasy. Long sections are based largely on speculation and not on ethnography, e.g., P. Efimenko, "Bratstva i soiuzy nishchikh," *Kievskaia starina* 9 (1883): 312–17; P. Efimenko, "Shpitali v Malorossii," *Kievskaia starina* 4 (1883): 709–25; V. Vasilenko, "Po voprosu o prizrenii slepykh i vsiakikh nishchikh," *Kievskaia starina* 7–9 (1904): 131–51.

63. Domanyts'kyi, 14; Hnatiuk, 6.

64. The regionalization of both the organizations as well as of minstrel performance practices is a complex topic, made more difficult by incomplete and sometimes confusing data from different researchers. See Slastion, 12; B. Kyrdan and A. Omel'chenko, *Narodni spivtsi-muzykanty na Ukraïni* (Kiev: Muzychna Ukraïna, 1980), 39; Kolessa, 56–57; see also Maryna Hrymych, "Vykonavtsi ukraïns'kykh dum," *Rodovid* 3 (1992): 14–21, and *Rodovid* 4 (1992): 18–25.

65. Most ethnographers in Ukraine have considered the *lebiis'ka mova* (the minstrels' language) to be unique to the *kobzari* and *lirnyky*. Others question this, and believe that the "secret language" of the minstrels was actually a widely disseminated jargon shared by other groups of people including (according to some) criminals in the Russian Empire of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For the first view see Hnatiuk, 1–6; for the second view, see O. Horbach, "Argo ukraïns'kykh lirnykiv," *Naukovi zapysky* (Munich: Ukraïns'kyi vil'nyi universytet) 1 (1957): 12–13 .

66. See, for example, the description by Hnatiuk (pp. 8–9) of the learning process of *lirnyk* Iakiv Zlatars'kyi from the Ternopil' region who in the 1880s had no fewer than six teachers over eight years. See also Malynka ("Kobzari S. Vlasko ta D. Symonenko," 123–24) on the apprenticeship and later teaching of *kobzar* Dem'ian Havrylovych Symonenko in the Chernihiv region, and Rusov, on the learning process of *kobzar* Ostap Veresai.

67. The two most detailed descriptions of this ritual are Borzhkovs'kyi, 657, and M. Drahomanov, "Novi varianty kobzars'kykh spiviv," *Zhytie i slovo* 4 (1895): 31–33.

68. Under the Sachs-Hornbostel system of instrument classification (widely used among ethnomusicologists), the *kobza* in the nineteenth century was a small plucked lute, the strings of which were usually (i.e., by most performers) sounded only in open position. Both hands were used to pluck the open strings. In the late nineteenth century, the strings normally numbered anywhere from eight to about thirty and were largely, but not entirely, diatonically tuned (cf. Kolessa, 61–62). Each *kobza* was hand made by a village craftsman, and each was a unique instrument with its own shape, measurements, sound, and to a certain extent technique. The other instrument of the blind minstrels, in Ukrainian *lira,* is the standard European hurdy-gurdy, an instrument widely distributed throughout the continent. Its Ukrainian examples are without significant modification from the pan-European

model. Both *kobza* and *lira* were usually performed solo, i.e., not in ensembles. The word *bandura* is likely of literary origin, perhaps dating from the sixteenth century. The word was apparently not used in villages in many if not most regions until the 1920s or 1930s. The *bandura* today is mass-produced and varies little from one manufacturer to another. It differs from the older hand-made village instrument in terms of shape, size, sound, and playing technique. It usually has sixty or more strings, tuned chromatically.

69. See, for example, Tiumenev, 39.

70. Klyment Kvitka, *Profesional'ni narodni spivtsi i muzykanty na Ukraïni* (Kiev: Zbirnyk Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu Ukraïns'koï akademiï nauk, 1924), 60–61; see also Borzhkovs'kyi, 657.

71. Hnatiuk, 2–4, 6; Rusov, 318; K.F.U.O. [K. F. Ukhach-Okhorovych], "Kobzar Ostap Veresai," *Kievskaia starina* 7 (1882): 261; Horlenko, "Kobzari," 25; this is also based on interviews I conducted in the Chernihiv region concerning apprenticeship in the early 1900s and 1920s.

72. See, for example, Kulish, 44; Rusov, 313, 317; Borzhkovs'kyi, 668; and Krist, 123.

73. Hnatiuk, 8; Borzhkovs'kyi, 668.

74. F. I. Lavrov, *Kobzar Ostap Veresai* (Kiev: Vydavnytstvo Akademiï nauk URSR, 1955), 5–18.

75. Kolessa, xiii–xiv; see also Lesia Ukraïnka, *Lysty* (Kiev, 1956) 5: 547.

76. Lavrov, 18–24; K. Danylenko, "Narodnyi spivets' kobzar Ivan Iovych Kuchuhura-Kucherenko..." IMFE fond 8-k.3, od. zb. 15, ark. 3–4, 1921; K.F.U.O., 263.

77. Hrushevs'ka, lxxix.

78. Krist, 129; Horlenko, "Bandurist"; A. I. Malynka, "Prokop Chub (perekhodnyi tip kobzaria)," *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 12 (1892): 165.

79. Speransʹkyi, 47–48; Horlenko, "Kobzari," 43; Tikhovskii, 135; Slastion, 10.

80. Speransʹkyi, 11; Malynka, "Kobzari i lirnyky," 66.

81. This familiar theme is described in dozens of studies, including Tamás Hofer, "The Creation of Ethnic Symbols from the Elements of Peasant Culture," in *Nationalism in Eastern Europe,* ed. Peter Sugar (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969), 101–48; and Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

82. For discussions of institutionalized urban-rural links see William Noll, "Cultural Contact through Music Institutions in Ukrainian Lands, 1920–1948," in *Musical Cultures in Contact: Convergences and Collisions,* ed. Margaret Kartomi and Stephen Blum (Sydney: Currency Press, 1994), 204–19 [=Australian Studies in the History, Philosophy and Social Studies of Music, 2]; William Noll, "Music Institutions and National Consciousness among Polish and Ukrainian Peasants," in *Ethnomusicology and Modern Music History,* ed. Stephen Blum, Philip Bohlman and Daniel Neuman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 139–58; and "Statut Tovarystva Prosvita," 1891, Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv u L'vovi, fond 348, op. 1, od. zb. 1, ark. 1–2.

83. Hnat Khotkevych, *K voprosu o tsikl peredvizhnykh etnograficheskikh kontsertov* (Kharkiv: Pechatnoe delo, 1916).

84. The details of this development are only tangentially related to a consideration of the peasant music practices of the blind minstrels, and are not discussed here. The term "national bandurists" is mine, but information on these musicians, called by other names or terms, can be found in: Ulas Samchuk, *Zhyvi struny. Bandura i bandurysty* (Detroit: Vydannia Kapeli bandurystiv im. Tarasa Shevchenka, 1976); Vasyl' Iemets', *U zolote 50-richchia na sluzhbi Ukraïni* and *Pro kozakiv-bandurnykiv* (Toronto, 1961); and Hryhory Kytasty, *Some Aspects of Ukrainian Music under the Soviets* (New York: Research Program on the USSR, 1954)[=Mimeograph Series no. 65][title page in English, text in Russian].

85. Hnat Khotkevych, *Pidruchnyk hry na banduri* (Kharkiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukraïny, 1930); see also "Repertuar ta marshruty pershoï Kyïvs'koï Kapely bandurystiv 1921–1934," *Materiialy z istoriï pershoï ukraïns'koï khudozhn'oï kapely kobzariv,* IMFE fond 14-kol. 1, od. zb. 6.

86. See, for example, among many others: Revuts'kyi, 63–64; M. Nahornyi, "Ukraïns'ki narodni spivsti—kobzari i lirnyky," *Narodna tvorchist'* 1 (1939): 50–57; and M. Polotai, "Mystetstvo kobzariv Radians'koï Ukraïny," *Radians'ka muzyka* 6 (1940): 23–34.

87. Ivan Haliun, "Novi kobzars'ki pisni," *Etnohrafichnyi visnyk* 7 (1928): 54.

88. Nevermore, "Z ruk zhebraka na posluhu radians'kii kul'turi," *Muzyka* 4 (1927): 29.

89. Described in Noll, "Cultural Contact."

90. Letters from *Kobzar* Kuchuhura-Kucherenko to M. I. Pryvaliv, IMFE fond 8-K-3, od. zb. 2, ark. 19–30, 1926; this is also based on interviews I conducted with elderly relatives of minstrels and other *startsi*.

91. M. T. Ryl's'kyi and F. I. Lavrov, *Kobzar Iehor Movchan* (Kiev: Vydavnytstvo Akademiï nauk URSR, 1958), 21.

92. E.g., Mykhailo Khai, "Au, autentyka! . . ." *Ukraïna* 45 (1989): 17–18; see also Kost' Cherems'kyi, "Z istoriï nyshchennia ukraïns'koho kobzarstva," *Nova Ukraïna* 2 (1993): 11–12. An earlier reference to this gathering was made in one version of the autobiography of Dmitrii Shostakovich, *Testimony: The Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979).

93. See also Kytasty.

DOCUMENTS

An Analysis of Disbursements for Diplomacy during the Ratification of the Hadiach Union Treaty at the Warsaw Diet of 1659

A. B. PERNAL

The accounts of the 1661 Ordinary General Crown Diet reveal that a sum of 76,532 zł 15 gr, which represents the largest single outlay in the diplomatic expenditures for the period from April 1659 to June 1661,[1] was spent by the Crown Treasury for the purpose of securing the ratification of the Hadiach Treaty of Union. By the addition of Ukraine, which was renamed the Grand Duchy of Rus', the treaty sought to transform the dual Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth into a triune state.[2]

The 22 May 1659 ratification of the Hadiach Union Treaty by the Diet marked both the end of an eleven-year struggle between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Ukraine and the beginning of their new co-existence in a radically restructured state. In the initial years of the conflict, from 1648 to 1653, an arrangement such as that reached at Hadiach on 16 September 1658 would have been impossible. The Treaty of Zboriv, concluded on 18 August 1649, and the Treaty of Bila Tserkva, signed on 28 September 1651, clearly revealed that a *de facto* dynamic and martial Cossack republic could not be accommodated within the framework of a conservative Polish-Lithuanian monarchy, a state in which the nobility held the reins of power. Early in 1654, when under the leadership of Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi Ukraine chose in Pereiaslav to become a quasi-protectorate of Muscovy, the heretofore largely regional conflict expanded and became more internationalized. In the same year Muscovy penetrated deeply into Lithuania; however, the Commonwealth was able to balance its losses by gaining military support from the Crimea, a former ally of Ukraine.

A new and a critical dimension to the existing hostilities was added by the Swedish invasion of Poland and Lithuania in the middle of 1655. The rapid conquest by the Swedes, which appeared to signal a total collapse of the Commonwealth and an alteration of the traditional balance of power in Eastern Europe, eventually led to the renewal of war between Muscovy and Sweden. The opening of a struggle between the two old antagonists enabled the Commonwealth to come to terms with Muscovy. On 3 November 1656 an armistice was arranged between them, as well as a military alliance against Sweden. The new rapprochement with Muscovy was also partially responsible for the failure of the Treaty of

Radnot of 6 December 1656, designed to partition the Commonwealth among Sweden and its allies, to become operative.

In 1657 the Commonwealth gained more strength with the conclusion of three anti-Swedish military alliances—with Austria on 27 May, with Denmark on 28 July, and with Brandenburg on 6 November. The last state was a former supporter of Sweden. Moreover Transylvania, an ally of Sweden and Ukraine, was forced out of the war on 24 July. In the same year the Commonwealth renewed its efforts to recover Ukraine.

The 1656 rapprochement between the Commonwealth and Muscovy was greatly resented by Khmel'nyts'kyi, who maintained that the tsar had betrayed Ukraine and sacrificed its interests for the sake of a promised Polish crown. Losing faith in Muscovy, gaining little from the alliances with Sweden and Transylvania, and fearing that Ukraine would lose its autonomy, Khmel'nyts'kyi began to grow more receptive towards the overtures of the Commonwealth. Shortly before his death (6 August 1657), Khmel'nyts'kyi began to negotiate with the Commonwealth's envoy, Stanisław Kazimierz Bieniewski. The parleys aimed at facilitating the re-entry of Ukraine, under new conditions, into the Polish-Lithuanian state.

Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, Khmel'nyts'kyi's successor as Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, convinced himself that the alliance which he had concluded with Sweden was of little practical value and that the *szlachta* democracy in Poland-Lithuania was far preferable to the Muscovite tsarist autocracy. Consequently he, too, turned to the Commonwealth. The time was ripe, for its nobility generally favored reaching an agreement, even at the price of great concessions, with Ukraine. While not openly breaking with Muscovy, Vyhovs'kyi instructed Pavlo Teteria-Morzhkovs'kyi to start negotiations with Bieniewski. A preliminary agreement was concluded at Hoshcha on 5 July 1658. Eventually the terms of Ukraine's union with Poland-Lithuania were decided upon in the Cossack military camp, near the town of Hadiach, on 16 September 1658, after arduous negotiations between Vyhovs'kyi and his associates—including Iurii Nemyrych—and the commissioners of the Commonwealth, Stanisław Kazimierz Bieniewski and Ludwik Kazimierz Jewłaszewski.

The text of the Treaty of Union stressed that the newly emerging state, comprising Poland, Lithuania and Rus', had been created as a result of a fusion of "freemen to freemen, equals to equals and honorable to honorable." The "three united nations" were henceforth required to find a basis for future co-existence in one triune Commonwealth, to participate in a joint central Diet, and to pursue a common foreign policy. All would acknowledge a common monarch who, for the sake of peace and tranquility, would proclaim a general amnesty, which was to apply to all transgressions since the 1648 outbreak of hostilities in Ukraine. Furthermore, after the conclusion of a special agreement between the Polish king and the Rus' hetman, the nobility could reclaim their abandoned estates in the southeastern palatinates. By such terms the Grand Duchy of Rus', the newest member of the Commonwealth, established close ties with the Kingdom of Poland

and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. These ties were very similar to those which had linked the two latter countries since the 1569 Union of Lublin.

Recognized as a separate administrative and political unit comprising the palatinates of Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv, which formerly were known as Ukraine, Rus′ was to have its own ministries, judiciary, treasury, and coinage. Moreover, its regular army was to be composed of mercenaries and registered Cossacks—the latter to number 60,000. Out of each regiment one hundred Cossacks were to be ennobled; thus, they were to gain the same rights and privileges as those enjoyed by the nobility of the Commonwealth. The highest lay dignitary of the new Grand Duchy would possess the office of the palatine of Kiev, as well as the rank of hetman of the Zaporozhian Host. The successor of Ivan Vyhovs′kyi was to be elected to the latter post with the participation of the Rus′ elite, and confirmed by the king.

The newest part of the Commonwealth also gained significant cultural and religious concessions. With regard to the former, two academies, or universities, were to be founded: one in Kiev, and another in a town to be designated in the near future. As concerned the latter, the Orthodox Church was to enjoy a superior position in Rus′. The Orthodox metropolitan and four eparchs were to be admitted to the Senate on a basis of equality with the Latin-rite hierarchy. All lay senatorial offices in Rus′ were to be filled only by the Orthodox nobility. While the Roman Catholic Church would be granted some toleration in the territory of the new Grand Duchy, the Byzantine-rite Catholic Church, which was commonly known as the Uniate Church, in existence since 1596, was to be abolished throughout the Commonwealth.

In the last week of October 1658, after their arrival in the military camp on the outskirts of Toruń, Bieniewski and Jewłaszewski made a report on the recently concluded Treaty of Union to King Jan Kazimierz and the senators. At the special meetings which followed, during which the implications of the treaty's terms were discussed, certain individuals criticized the commissioners for being "too generous" to the "Cossacks." Eventually the following decision was reached: the Treaty of Union was to be accepted in principle; however, its various "unacceptable" articles—such as the abolition of the Byzantine-rite Catholic Church and the exclusion of the Roman Catholic nobility from the senatorial offices of the Grand Duchy of Rus′—had to be renegotiated.

Bieniewski, who was given this unenviable task, by February 1659 had only managed to secure Vyhovs′kyi's promise to make some minor changes in the text of the original treaty. Since the king had already issued writs for the March convocation of the Diet in Warsaw, at which the Union Treaty was to be ratified, this problem had to be resolved quickly. It appears that, due to the shortage of time, the king and his advisors had decided to pursue the following course of action: first, to secure the desired amendments to the treaty by exerting pressure on the diplomatic delegations from the Grand Duchy of Rus′; and second, this done, to use the same tactic in order to gain Vyhovs′kyi's agreement to the changes.

Having provided essential details relating to the topic, we shall examine the chronology of events pertaining to the ratification of the Hadiach Treaty of Union at the Warsaw Diet of 1659.

In mid-March 1659 Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi informed King Jan Kazimierz and Crown Grand Chancellor Mikołaj Prażmowski that he was sending Matiiash Papkevych, Colonel of the Irkliïv Regiment, and Havrylo Lysovs'kyi, Aide-de-Camp-General, who were to acquaint them, among other matters, with the itinerary of the main diplomatic delegation, led by Tymish Nosach, Quartermaster-General of the Zaporozhian Host. Vyhovs'kyi stressed that the Treaty of Union should not be ratified prior to the arrival of this delegation.[3]

Two smaller diplomatic delegations, sent earlier by Vyhovs'kyi, appeared in Warsaw after the 22 March opening of the Diet.[4] Upon arriving in the capital on 4 April, the first, headed by Fedir Vyhovs'kyi, the Cossack hetman's cousin, and Hryhorii Lisnyts'kyi, Colonel of the Myrhorod Regiment, began the customary rounds of ceremonial meetings comprising royal audiences and informal discussions. During these initial contacts Fedir Vyhovs'kyi revealed his fluency in Polish, his general diplomatic competence, and his uncompromising position with regard to a revision of the religious terms of the treaty.[5]

With the passage of time, it became obvious to all concerned that these and other diplomatic representatives from the Grand Duchy of Rus' were of one mind—no concessions—and that due to mounting opposition in the Senate and the House of Envoys—here the nuncio, Pietro Vidoni, was very active—the treaty would not be ratified by the Diet without the necessary amendments. Therefore, the king and his supporters decided to appeal directly to Vyhovs'kyi. Both they and the hetman had a great stake in the Treaty of Union; thus, it had to be ratified by this Diet. Since Bieniewski was reluctant to try his luck for the third time, this crucial mission was entrusted to his assistant, Krzysztof Peretiatkowicz, who was fully familiar with all phases of the negotiations. Peretiatkowicz departed from Warsaw on 12 April, completed his task at the close of the month, and on 8 May—in record time—was back in the capital with a revised text of the treaty.[6]

The new text stipulated that the Byzantine-rite Catholic Church would be allowed to exist on a restricted basis throughout the Commonwealth. The Roman Catholics were to enjoy full religious liberties within the Grand Duchy of Rus'. Lay senatorial offices were to be granted, in the palatinates of Bratslav and Chernihiv, to both the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox nobility. A fifth Orthodox eparch, from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, was to gain a seat in the Senate. The autonomy of Rus' in foreign affairs was curtailed. The quota for its regular army, which was to be supported by the taxes of the entire Commonwealth, was set at 10,000 mercenaries and 30,000 registered Cossacks. The hetman's mace would remain in the Vyhovs'kyi family. Amnesty, back pay for military service, and the return of property would not apply to those who served with the Swedes.[7]

In the meantime, on 20 April, as Peretiatkowicz was still on his way to Chyhyryn, another diplomatic delegation had arrived in Warsaw.[8] It was headed

by Ivan's brother Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi, Colonel of the Turaŭ (Turiv) Regiment, and Iurii Nemyrych, Chamberlain of Kiev, who had already been designated by the Cossack hetman for the important new office of Grand Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Rus'.[9] Both were able diplomats. Their skills were first revealed on 23 April, at an audience before Jan Kazimierz and a joint session of the Diet.[10] However, it was the address by Nemyrych, which stressed the significance of the Union Treaty both for the Grand Duchy of Rus' and the Commonwealth as a whole,[11] that caused a sensation in Warsaw. The address soon began to circulate in handwritten copies throughout the state[12] and eventually, in a published form, throughout Western Europe.[13]

Another sensation in the capital was caused by a new petition which the delegation presented to the Diet. The four-part petition, calling for "the execution of the Hadiach Pacts," not only stood firm on the original terms of the Treaty of Union, but also requested additional concessions, such as the incorporation of the palatinates of Volhynia, Podolia, and Ruthenia into the Grand Duchy of Rus'.[14] As negotiations began between the two parties, it soon became clear that the religious issue—abolition of the Byzantine-rite Catholic Church—was the most difficult problem to solve.[15] After the arrival of Peretiatkowicz on 8 May, a messenger was dispatched to Vyhovs'kyi, who was asked for a categorical declaration relating the new requests of his diplomats. By the middle of May his reply reached Warsaw. The hetman agreed to abide by the terms of the revised treaty and instructed his colleagues to withdraw all the demands that were unacceptable to the Diet.[16] Earlier, he had also requested that there be no further delay in the ratification of the Treaty of Union, and that the entire delegation from Rus' be sent back as soon as possible.[17]

Finally, at the height of this feverish activity, the third delegation under Nosach, accompanied by Ivan Hrusha, Secretary-General of the Host, entered Warsaw on 10 May.[18] Shortly after his arrival, Hrusha prepared a "register" of persons selected to swear oaths during the ceremonies marking the ratification of the Treaty of Union. They were grouped in two categories: "grand envoys" and representatives from Cossack regiments, including those from the Zaporozhian Sich. This register was eventually expanded to include additional notables, staff and retinue members: fifty-two persons were identified by name, rank or office, while only the numerical size of the retinues was given, totalling 441. Thus, Hrusha's register comprised a grand total of 493 persons.[19]

Once completed, the register was passed on to the Crown Treasury, where preliminary calculations were made as to the cost of the cloth gifts—the higher the rank or office, the more expensive the gift—which were to be distributed among the envoys, Cossack officers, and the rank-and-file of the retinues. Once the cost had been determined, this information was forwarded to the Senate which on 20 May authorized the Crown Treasury to distribute cloth gifts valued at a maximum of 20,000 zł.[20] Finally, a clean copy of a new register, with new headings, was compiled in the Crown Treasury. While some names from the Hrusha list were

deleted, others were added to the new register. According to it, the "Cossacks," who were granted "honoraria" by the king and the senators, comprised the following categories: five chief officers and diplomats; twenty-six representatives of thirteen Cossack regiments,[21] including three from the Kish of the Zaporozhian Sich; twenty-two individuals designated as courtiers, and others, as staff and servants of the envoys and Ivan Vyhovs'kyi; and 465 retinue members—a total of 521 persons. This undated document bears the signature of Ivan Hrusha.[22]

While the official delegation representing the Grand Duchy of Rus' and the Zaporozhian Host was already quite large, other individuals, even though they appeared in a "private" capacity, did play an active role in the ratification process. These included Pavlo Teteria-Morzhkovs'kyi, former Colonel of the Pereiaslav Regiment;[23] Dionysii Balaban, Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev, and other members of the Orthodox hierarchy;[24] and those representing the Byzantine rite in union with the Holy See, led by Havryïl Kolienda, Archeparch of Polatsk.[25] If these are counted, including their staff and servants, it is safe to say that over six hundred persons participated in various ways in the Warsaw proceedings during the months of April and May.

Finally, on 22 May 1659, during the Feast of the Ascension of Our Lord, the oath-taking ceremonies brought to a conclusion the ratification proceedings of the Hadiach Treaty of Union. The three "estates" of the Commonwealth were represented by the following persons, each of whom swore an oath to observe the terms of the treaty: King Jan Kazimierz; Archbishop of Gniezno Wacław Leszczyński, Bishop of Vilnius Jan Zawisza, Crown Grand Hetman Stanisław Potocki, Lithuanian Grand Hetman Paweł Sapieha, Crown Grand Marshal Jerzy Lubomirski, Crown Grand Chancellor Mikołaj Prażmowski, Lithuanian Grand Chancellor Krzysztof Pac, Crown Vice-Chancellor Bogusław Leszczyński, and Lithuanian Vice-Chancellor Aleksander Naruszewicz; Marshal (Speaker) of the House of Envoys Jan Gniński.[26]

The representatives of the new Grand Duchy of Rus' and the Zaporozhian Host followed, and after oath-taking, each participant subscribed the written text of the oath.[27] Iurii Nemyrych, due to various reasons, swore and subscribed the text of the oath on 24 May.[28] Six days later, on 30 May, the Diet concluded its deliberations.[29]

Most of the diplomats and their retinues remained in Warsaw until 10 June, for on that date they received their alloted "honoraria,"[30] including the additional cloth which was requested by Hrusha.[31] It should be noted that additional significant non-cash rewards were distributed to both the diplomats in Warsaw and other significant supporters of the Union of Hadiach who were not present in the capital. The staff of the Crown Chancery was extremely busy preparing various documents relating to ennoblements, land grants, ennoblements and land grants, reconfirmation of nobiliary status and property ownership, special privileges, various honors and profitable offices in the new Grand Duchy of Rus'.[32] All the diplomatic delegations departed from Warsaw by 21 June.[33]

The episode described above reveals both the unique constitutional-political arrangement—the emergence of a new triune confederative state in Eastern Europe—and the specific characteristics of Commonwealth diplomacy. Despite many problems, resulting chiefly from the hostilities known as the Second Northern War, the functioning of the Commonwealth's diplomatic machine was adequate to enable the diplomats to carry out their missions.[34]

*

*   *

The accounts of the 1661 Ordinary General Crown Diet described and justified the expenditure of 76,532 zł 15 gr as follows:

> [A sum] for the provision of envoys [and members of their retinues in Warsaw], sent from the Zaporozhian Host to the Diet in 1659 relating to the matter of [ratifying a treaty of] eternal peace, as well as for their gifts, [which was] disbursed in accordance with the resolution declared by the Senate; including in it, [moreover, costs for all] the extraordinary dispatches expedited from the Diet for [urgent] conferences with the Honorable [Ivan] Vyhovs'kyi, at that time Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, as well as [expenses pertaining to] the hosting of those envoys during their itineraries.[35]

While the above passage clarifies the general aims of the expenditures, it fails to satisfy the curiosity of historians seeking details. Thus, they must ask the following questions: for whom, how, and precisely for what purposes was this sum spent? Fortunately, since many relevant original documents have been preserved for researchers in Polish archives and libraries—notwithstanding the terrible ravages suffered by the repositories as a result of looting, theft, fires, and wars in the past three and a half centuries—these questions can now be answered.

Some details relating to the disbursement of 76,532 zł 15 gr are provided by two documents. Both documents, which reveal the expenditures formally authorized by the Senate, were signed by Crown Grand Chancellor Mikołaj Prażmowski and Crown Vice-Chancellor Bogusław Leszczyński. The first, dated at Warsaw on 20 May, authorized the Crown Treasury to distribute various "silks and woolens" worth up to 20,000 zł for the "clothing and garments," as well as "other needs," of the diplomats and their retinues. Eventually an exact sum was calculated by the Crown Treasury for this purpose—19,440 zł 15 gr.[36] The second document, dated at Warsaw on 3 June, lists disbursements in the amount of 55,047 zł for the "provisions of Cossack envoys and couriers, who were expedited...by the Honorable Hetman Vyhovs'kyi and the Zaporozhian Host to the present Diet [in 1659]."[37] The two sums yield a total of 74,487 zł 15 gr; thus, there were still some unspecified expenditures for an additional 2,045 zł.

Two other items (besides the numerous payment orders to individuals and groups) shed additional light on the above-mentioned sum of 76,532 zł 15 gr. They concern the brief references located in the military accounts. They were prepared

by Jan Cinachi (Cynaki) and Piotr Talenti (Talenty), both of whom were factors of the Crown Treasury. Talenty's statement shows that by 9 June he had distributed cloth to the envoys and their retinues valued at 8,984 zł 17 gr 9 d;[38] that of Cynaki, whose accounts are dated 6 July, reveals a similar distribution valued at 11,902 zł 5 gr.[39] The two sums total 20,886 zł 22 gr 9 d.

The orders of payment provide more precise information. Issued by Jacek Bianchi (Bianki), senior Notary of the Crown Treasury, and addressed to either Cynaki or Talenty, these orders list the names of recipients—when applicable, also their military ranks and office titles—and specify both the number of ells and the type of cloth they were to receive—usually satin, velvet, damask, silk taffeta, and woolens. Most are dated 10 June. Individuals certified the receipt of cloth by their signatures, and its value was recorded on the backs of documents. As a rule, Cynaki distributed cloth to individual recipients, as well as to two officers representing each Cossack regiment, while Talenty distributed it to various groups constituting the retinues of the envoys.[40]

This form of remuneration was used instead of cash payments because the Crown Treasury faced a chronic shortage of funds. Even in times of peace it was compelled to introduce deficit budgets.[41] It should be noted that during the Second Northern War (1655–1660), the great devastation of the Commonwealth and its other problems contributed to a much more acute shortage of funds. Under such circumstances, even the army had to be "paid" in cloth, which was borrowed from the factors or wealthy merchants who were, as a rule, promised to be repaid from the forthcoming levy of new taxes by the Diet.[42]

In calculating the expenditures in cloth, it becomes apparent that between 20 May (Senate authorization for a sum of up to 20,000 zł) and 21 June (departure of remaining envoys from Warsaw), additional outlays, valued at 700 zł, had to be made—that is, in excess of the sum of 19,440 zł 15 gr. This being the case, the total value of cloth distributed by the factors was actually 20,140 zł 15 gr (19,440 zł 15 gr + 700 zł).[43] In calculating and determining the estimated sum it is assumed that Talenty provided cloth for the total amount he reported on 9 June, that is, 8,984 zł 17 gr 9 d, and that Cynaki had distributed cloth by 21 June valued at 11,155 zł 27 gr 9 d (the two sums equal 20,140 zł 15 gr). Thus, between 22 June and 6 July (the date of Cynaki's statement), he must have provided additional cloth gifts valued at 746 zł 7 gr 9 d; however, these were unconnected with the diplomatic representatives and their retinues who had arrived in Warsaw for the ratification of the Union Treaty of Hadiach.

It should also be noted that the document of 3 June, which lists the sum of 55,047 zł as the total for expenditures relating to diplomatic missions, is both incorrectly added and incomplete in details. The correct total should be 55,044 zł;[44] moreover, to that total should be added 1,345 zł, a sum which represents the cost of four additional missions between 12 April and 24 May.[45] Thus, the total amount should read 56,389 zł (or 56,392 zł, with the addition of the error of 3 zł).

The addition of cloth valued at 20,140 zł 15 gr to the cash outlays for diplomatic missions in the amount of 56,389 zł (+3 zł for error) produces a total of 76,532 zł 15 gr, which corresponds to the sum listed in the statement of the 1661 Diet accounts.

*
* *

Insofar as possible I have followed the instruction pertaining to the publication of Polish-language primary sources.[46] The seventeenth-century Polish spelling and punctuation have generally been modernized; however, certain peculiarities have been retained—for example, *ociec* and *wszytkich*, including, where they occur, Ukrainian versions of names, such as *Andrej*. Most abbreviations have been expanded. Appendix 1 lists those that appear in the documents, text, and footnotes. All translations from Polish are my own. Certain terms are impossible to translate into English; for example, I have rendered *JMP* (*jego miłościwy pan*) as "honorable." All dates, unless otherwise indicated, are given in New Style. Latin words and phrases in the Polish-language documents have been italicized. With one exception—the omission of ligatures—transliterations from the Cyrillic alphabet follow the Library of Congress system. Items 1–8 contain relevant documents and calculations. Appendix 2 will be useful in complementing and supplementing the work of George Gajecky,[47] Document 8 in revealing the seventeenth-century spelling of Ukrainian names. I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Brandon University Research Committee for providing funds which enabled me to conduct research in Poland.

Brandon University

NOTES

1. The 1661 Diet accounts start from 18 April 1659; however, several expenditures prior to that date are also included. They were audited on 11 June 1661. See AGAD, ASK, od. II, RS, ks. 55, fos. 2^r and 77^r.

2. The following is a survey of events from May 1648 to February 1659. Since thousands of titles—biographies, monographs, and articles—have been published on this period, readers are urged to consult the bibliographies of the following recent publications: Robert I. Frost, *After the Deluge: Poland-Lithuania in the Second Northern War, 1655–1660* (Cambridge, 1993); Janusz Kaczmarczyk, *Bohdan Chmielnicki* (Wrocław, 1988); V. A. Smolii and V. S. Stepankov, *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi. Sotsial'no-politychnyi portret* (Kiev, 1993); Frank E. Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985); and Zbigniew Wójcik, ed., *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, 3 vols. (Warsaw, 1980–82), vol. 2. On the background, terms, and evaluations of the Hadiach Treaty of Union see Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, new ed., 10 vols. (New York, 1954–58) 10: 231–359; Ludwik Kubala, *Wojny duńskie i pokój oliwski 1657–1660* (L'viv [Lwów], 1922), 84–112, 238–57; Wacław Lipiński [Viacheslav Lypyns'kyi], "Dwie chwile z dziejów porewolucyjnej Ukrainy," in Wacław Lipiński, ed., *Z dziejów Ukrainy. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci*

Włodzimierza Antonowicza, Paulina Święcickiego i Tadeusza Rylskiego (Kiev [Kijów], 1912), 578–617; Vasyl' Herasymchuk, "Vyhovshchyna i Hadiats'kyi traktat," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* 87 (1909): 5–36; 88 (1909): 23–50; 89 (1909): 46–90; M. Stadnyk, "Hadiats'ka uniia," *Zapysky Ukraïns'koho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyïvi* 7 (1910): 65–85; 8 (1911): 5–39; Władysław Tomkiewicz, "Unia hadziacka," *Sprawy Narodowościowe* 11 (1937): 1–31; Ioannes Praszko, *De Ecclesia Ruthena Catholica sede metropolitana vacante, 1655–1665* (Rome, 1944); Stanisław Kot, *Jerzy Niemirycz w 300–lecie ugody hadziackiej* (Paris, 1960); Andrzej Kamiński, "The Cossack Experiment in *Szlachta* Democracy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: The Hadiach (*Hadziacz*) Union," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 2 (June 1977): 178–97; A. B. Pernal, "The Initial Step towards the Union of Hadiach: Bieniewski's First Diplomatic Mission to Ukraine in 1657," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 25, no. 2 (June 1983): 284–300; idem, "In Defense of the Union of Brest: The Role of the Apostolic Nuncio Pietro Vidoni at the Warsaw Diet of 1659," *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 9, no. 1 (June 1989): 37–45; and idem, "The Union of Hadiach (1658) in the Light of Modern Polish Historiography," in O. W. Gerus and A. Baran, eds., *Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, 988–1988* (Winnipeg, 1989), 177–92. BCzart., MS 402, pp. 281–90 contains the original Polish text of the treaty dated 6/16 September 1658, as well as the text that was amended on 30 April 1659—but bearing the same date—and ratified by the Diet on 22 May 1659. The latter text was published as one of the "constitutions" of the Diet. See *VL* 4:297–301, and *Materialy*, 112–19. For an English translation of both treaties see A. B. Pernal, "The Polish Commonwealth and Ukraine: Diplomatic Relations, 1648–1659," unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of Ottawa, 1977), 535–52.

3. Ivan Vyhovs'kyi to Mikołaj Prażmowski, Camp by Zin'kiv, 7/17 March 1659, and to Jan Kazimierz, Camp by Zin'kiv, 9/19 March 1659, *Pamiatniki* (1st ed.) 3, pt. 3, 310–13.

4. See *VL* 4:272.

5. Pietro Vidoni to the Holy See, Warsaw, 5 and 12 April 1659: *LNA* 9:240, 247; and Jan Mierzeński to Bogusław Radziwiłł, Warsaw, 4 and 7 April 1659, AGAD, AR, dz. V, no. 9646, t. 201, cz. 1, 161, 166.

6. Peretiatkowicz's receipt of 400 zł, Warsaw, 12 April 1659, AGAD, ASK, od. IV, KR, ks. 14, fo. 685^r, and his "Information," *Pamiatniki* (2nd ed.) 3, pt. 3, 348–54.

7. With regard to the revised text, see n. 2 above. According to my calculation, based on Peretiatkowicz's "Information," the treaty was signed by Vyhovs'kyi on 30 April 1659.

8. Pietro Vidoni to the Holy See, Warsaw, 26 April 1659: *LNA* 9:253.

9. Ivan Vyhovs'kyi to Mikołaj Prażmowski, Rzhyshchiv, 17/27 December 1658: *Pamiatniki* (1st ed.) 3, pt. 3, 295–96. Janusz Tazbir claims, without any supporting documentation, that Nemyrych's "signature appeared second only to the hetman's [i.e., Ivan Vyhovs'kyi's] on the Hadjač agreement concluded 16 September 1658," and that he was already a "chancellor" on 23 April 1659. See "The Political Reversals of Jurij Nemyryč," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 3 (September 1981): 316.

10. See the description of the Gdańsk representatives at the Diet: Warsaw, 23 April 1659: WAPGd., RSZP, MS 300, 29, 149, fos. 31^v–34^r; and WAPGd., RMG, MS 300, 29, 274, p. 416.

11. For the English translation of this address see George Hunston Williams, *The Polish Brethren: Documentation of the History and Thought of Unitarianism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and in the Diaspora, 1601–1685*, 2 pts. (Missoula, Montana, 1980), 510–14.

12. The Gdańsk representatives included its text with their report on the activities of the Diet of 1659, WAPGd., RMG, MS 300, 29, 274, pp. 416–18. It can be found as well in many copy books of contemporaries.

13. Various publications of the address must be understood as a propaganda effort of the royal court. See, for example, *Orationes Oder Reden, Derer eine von dem Herrn Niemeryczen Kijowischem Podkomorzi Als Abesandtem der Zaporowischen Kozaken und Gross Fürstenthumbs Reusslandt, den 23. Aprill dieses lauffenden Jahres. Die andere von dessen Herrn Bruder Steffan Niemieryczen...* (n.p., 1659).

14. See *Pamiatniki* (1st ed.) 3, pt. 3, 315–28; *Materialy*, 130–32; and Domet Olianchyn, "Punkty Ivana Vyhovs'koho ukraïns'kym poslam na varshavs'kyi seim 1659 roku," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. T. Shevchenka* 222 (1991): 327–39.

15. See the report of the Gdańsk representatives, Warsaw, 25 April 1659, WAP, RSZP, MS 300, 29, 149, fo. 35r; Jan Mierzeński to Bogusław Radziwiłł, Warsaw, 7 May 1659, AGAD, AR, dz. V, no. 9646, t. 201, cz. 2, p. 7. The most detailed information about this matter can be found in the reports of Pietro Vidoni to the Holy See from 22 March to 31 May 1659, *LNA* 9:228–85. See also Pernal, "In Defence of the Union of Brest," 37–45, and Praszko, *De Ecclesia Ruthena Catholica*, 62–100.

16. See *Glaubwurdingen Bericht, welcher gestalt Die Kosakische HHn: Abgesandten, Ihr. K.M. v. den Krohn Pohlen den 17. dieses den Eydt Ihrer Treu u. gehorsambs abgeleget, und was ferner auff diesen Reichs-Tage fürgefallen...*(n.p., 1659), p. [1].

17. Ivan Vyhovs'kyi to Jan Kazimierz, Chyhyryn, 26 April/6 May 1659, in *Pamiatniki* (1st ed.) 3, pt. 3, 329–30.

18. Chrapowicki noted the arrival of Nosach on 10 May, Jan Antoni Chrapowicki, *Diariusz*, ed. Tadeusz Wasilewski, 2 pts. (Warsaw, 1978–88), pt. 1, p. 194. Mierzeński reported that Hrusha had arrived on 10 May and that Nosach was expected the following day. Jan Mierzeński to Bogusław Radziwiłł, Warsaw, 10 May 1659, AGAD, AR, dz. V, no. 9646, t. 201, cz. 2, p. 12. I assume that Nosach arrived late on the 10th.

19. See Document 1.

20. See Document 2.

21. If Ivan Bohatyrenko and Kalyn Sokolovs'kyi belonged to the Kiev Regiment, fourteen regiments were represented.

22. See Document 3. Since Iurii Nemyrych also participated in the ratification ceremonies, the official total should be increased by one, to 522 persons.

23. Pietro Vidoni to the Holy See, Warsaw, 12 and 16 April 1659, *LNA* 9:243, 249.

24. Metropolitan Balaban arrived in Warsaw on 29 April. See Chrapowicki, *Diariusz*, pt. 1, 193.

25. Kolienda arrived in the capital on 15 March. See Pietro Vidoni to the Holy See, Warsaw, 15 March 1659, *LNA* 9:228.

26. See *VL* 4:305–306; *AIuZR*, 4:211–13. The ceremony is described in Lipiński, "Dwie chwile," 607.

27. The document is not dated. I assume that the representatives signed it on 22 May. For the original text and signatures see BCzart., MS 402, 249–51 and Document 8. Published versions are in *VL* 4:306–307; *AIuZR* 4:213–214; and Kubala, *Wojny duńskie*, 483–84.

28. See Lipiński, "Dwie chwile," 607–608. I assume that on 22 May a space was purposely left on the document, so that Nemyrych could sign its upper right column on 24 May.

29. See Chrapowicki, *Diariusz*, pt. 1, p. 194.

30. See Calculation 4, and Pietro Vidoni to the Holy See, Warsaw, 14 June 1659, *LNA* 9:295.

31. Ivan Hrusha to [Jacek Bianchi, Warsaw, ca. 11 June 1659], AGAD, ASK, od. III, RNK, ks. 5, fo. 755r. It lists nine names—Jarosz Niec[z]ewicz, Hrehory Drabowicz, Krzysztof Mlekicki, Daniel Kuryłowicz, Wojciech Garbada, Ułas[?] Młodzianowski, Stefan Postołowski, Mikołaj Woskowski and Wasyl Sostaczenko [Szostakowski]. The first two, and the last, signed an order for payment for 406 zł on 12 June. See AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 723r. Hrusha wrote: "Już też ostatnią kartę przez tych ludzi wmp posyłam, tylko uniżenie proszę, abyś tych jako ludzi godny[ch] ukontentował; jeśli który co wziął, niech to wróci, byleby przecie między podlejszych nie był poczytany. Brat i sługa. Jan Hrusza mp."

32. See *VL* 4:301–305, 318–19; *AIuZR* 4:214–19; Zygmunt Wdowiszewski, *Regesty nobilitacji w Polsce (1404–1794)*, ed. Adam Heymowski (Buenos Aires-Stockholm, 1987), 72–76 [=*Materiały do biografii, genealogii i heraldyki polskiej. Źródła i opracowania*, vol. 9]; AGAD, MK, KP, ks. 1, pp. 246–93; and AGAD, ML, dz. VIII, no. 1, fos. 78v–83v. At present Patricia Kennedy Grimsted is preparing a source publication which will contain full texts of various privileges, charters, grants, and patents contained in the "Ruthenian Metrica." A separate study is needed for the analysis of this interesting topic.

33. Pietro Vidoni to the Holy See, Warsaw, 21 June 1659, *LNA* 9:298.

34. For the best account of Commonwealth diplomacy during this period see Zbigniew Wójcik, "Dyplomacja polska w okresie wojen drugiej połowy XVII wieku (1648–1699)," in *Historia dyplomacji polskiej* 2:163–330.

35. AGAD, ASK, od. II, RS, ks. 55, fo. 63^r.

36. See Document 2.

37. See Document 6.

38. AGAD, ASK, od. 86, RW, ks. 45, fo. 18^r.

39. Ibid., fo. 17^r.

40. See, for example, Document 5.

41. See Roman Rybarski, *Skarb i pieniądz za Jana Kazimierza, Michała Korybuta i Jana III* (Warsaw, 1939), 456–61.

42. Ibid., 461–68. It is interesting to note that during the crucial negotiations at Hadiach, the commissioners of the Commonwealth, Stanisław Kazimierz Bieniewski and Ludwik Kazimierz Jewłaszewski, were so short of funds that they had to borrow 20,000 zł from Iurii Nemyrych. See Franciszek Pułaski, *Opis 815 rękopisów Biblioteki Ordynacji hr. Krasińskich* (Warsaw, 1915), 279.

43. See Calculation 4.

44. See Document 6.

45. See Calculation 7.

46. *Instrukcja wydawnicza dla źródeł historycznych od XVI do połowy XIX wieku* (Wrocław, 1953).

47. George Gajecky, *The Cossack Administration of the Hetmanate*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1978). The author is preparing a new edition of this work.

DOCUMENTS AND CALCULATIONS

1

[Warsaw, ca. 11–13 May 1659]

The first part of this "register," which lists the names, ranks, and offices of persons who were designated to participate in the oath-taking ceremony marking the final act in the ratification of the Hadiach Treaty of Union, was prepared by Ivan Hrusha, Secretary-General of the Zaporozhian Host. It is interesting that certain representatives of the Grand Duchy of Rus′ and the Zaporozhian Host are considered to be "grand envoys," that is, diplomats of the highest rank. Since the register is not dated, I assume that Hrusha compiled the names on 11 May 1659, one day after his arrival in Warsaw. Moreover, I assume that additions to the register, made in two other hands, which list additional names and specify the number of personnel in the retinues, were completed by the 13th. It seems most likely that one part of these additions was written by Havryïl Slonevs′kyi, Hrusha's "servant." Using the register as a guide, the staff at the Crown Treasury compiled a preliminary estimate — perhaps by the 16th — relating to the cost of the cloth gifts which were to be distributed to all members of this large diplomatic mission. Once completed, this information was forwarded to the Senate which, on 20 May, authorized the Crown Treasury to distribute cloth gifts valued up to 20,000 zł. See Document 2. Some names — marked here with asterisks — were deleted from the register. I assume that this was done on 21 May, when a clean copy of the register was made. See Document 3.

Original, AGAD, ASK, od. III, RNK, ks. 5, fos. 753ʳ–754ʳ.

[fo. 753ʳ]

Rejestr należących osób do przysięgi

Posłowie wielcy:

Pan Konstanty Wyhowski

* Pan podkomorzy kijowski[1]

Z osobna: Pan Tymosz Nosacz, oboźny wojskowy

Pan Hryhory Leśnicki, płk mirhorodzki

Pan Teodor Wyhowski

* Matiasz Papkiewicz, płk irklejewski

* Hawryło Lisowski, asauł wojskowy

Z pułków zaś

Najpierwiej z czehryńskiego:

Pan Jaśko Wowczenko, set. kryłowski

Pan Michajło Burmaka, set. śmiłowski

z czerkaskiego:	Matwiej Odyniec, asauł pułkowy
	Semen Dżułajenko, syn płk. czerkaskiego
z kaniowskiego:	Waśko Mitczenko, set. kaniowski
	Andrej Butenko, płk przeszły kaniowski
z korsuńskiego:	Meleszko Tywonko, set. korsuński
	Iwan Połowczenko
z perejasławskiego:	Stefan Sulima, płk perejasławski
	Andrej Romanenko, sędzia pułkowy
z białocerkiewskiego:	Semen Lobusenko, set. stawiski
	Andrej Rudyka, set. nastawski
z Kosza samego:	Kiryło Andryjewicz, płk koszowy
	Semen Cybulenko, towarzysz z Kosza
	Pisarz koszowy Krzyśko
z niżyńskiego:	Iwan Kosiński, set. wertijowski
	Jakub Hulanicki, brat pana płk. niżyńskiego
z mirhorodzkiego:	Onyśko Towstowicz, set. piskowski
	Wasyl Skrebet, set. łochwicki
z humańskiego:	Maksym Bułyha, set. ziatkowski

	Hryhory Biłohrud, set. babański
z połtawskiego:	Iwan Hrycuta, set. bahacki
	Hryćko Zarudny
z czernihowskiego:	Tymosz Nihowicz, pisarz pułkowy
	Niczypor Hryhorowicz, set. siedniowski

[753v]

z pawołockiego:	Iwan Fiłonenko, set. torczycki
	Wasyl Petrowski, set. chodorkowski
z kalnickiego:	Feśko Mikitenko, set. kalnicki
	Feśko Dulski, set. iliński
	*Iwan Zarudny, syn sędziego wojskowego
	Ostap Feckiewicz, zięć pana oboźnego
	Ostap Lejbenko, drugi zięć tegoż
	Jakub Nosaczenko, syn pana oboźnego
	Stefan Doroszenko, brat pana płk. przyłuckiego
	Mikołaj Jaworski, kancelarysta wojskowy[2]
	Teodor Sulima
	*Ociec kapelan[3]
	Hryhory Hulanicki, trzeci zięć pana oboźnego[4]

Pan Teodor Wyhowski

A przy nim:	Kalin Sokołowski, set.
	Iwan Bohatyrewicz, set.

Hryhory Leśnicki, płk mirhorodzki

A przy nim:	Iwan Rudnicki, pisarz pułkowy
	Hryhory Kotużowski, set.
	Kiryło Szyraj, set.[5]

[fo. 754r]

Jm pan pisarz Hrusza

Gabriel Słoniewski, sługa jm

U pana Nosaczacza [*sic*]	kozaków na sz. 180
Z panem Wyhowskim Konstantym	kozaków na sz. 90
Z panem Niemirzyczem	kozaków na sz. 120
U pana Teodora Wyhowskim [*sic*]	kozaków na sz. 21
U pana płk. mirhorodzkiego	kozaków na sz. 30

[fo. 754v]

Cover title: Rejestr należących osób Kozaków Zaporoskich do przysięgi.

2

Warsaw, 20 May 1659

A formal resolution of the Senate authorizing Jan Kazimierz Krasiński, Crown Grand Treasurer, to distribute cloth gifts valued at a maximum of 20,000 zł—eventually it was determined that their actual cost was 19,440 zł 15 gr—to all members of the diplomatic mission from the Grand Duchy of Rus′ and the Zaporozhian Host who arrived in Warsaw to participate in the ratification proceedings of the Hadiach Treaty of Union at the Diet of 1659. The document is signed by Mikołaj Prażmowski, Crown Grand Chancellor, and Bogusław Leszczyński, Crown Vice-Chancellor.

Original, AGAD, ASK, od.VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 671.

[fo. 671r]

Wiadomo czynię skarbowi Rzeczypospolitej koronnemu, iż naznaczono *ex senatus consulto*, aby na ukontentowanie i odprawę posłów od Wojska Zaporoskiego *in negotio pacis* na teraznejszy sejm przysłanych, wydano było z skarbu Rzeczypospolitej koronnego na odźież i suknie, tak samych posłów, jako i wszytkich z nimi będących Kozaków, w bławatach i suknach różnych i inszych potrzebach nie więcej nad 20 000 zł. Co wszytko

circa liquidationem na przyszłych rachunkach jw jm panu podskarbiemu wielkiemu koronnemu przyjęto będzie. Na co się własną podpisałem ręką.[6] W Warszawie, *die* 20 *maii* 1659.

Ksiądz Mikołaj Prażmowski, kanclerz wielki koronny
Bogusław na Lesznie [Leszczyński], podkanclerzy wielki koronny

[fo. 671ᵛ]

Senatus consultum na ukontentowanie i odprawę posłów od Wojska Zaporoskiego przysłanych na sejm [w] 1659 [roku], na które wydano suknami i bławatami *fl* 19 440/15.

3

[Warsaw, ca. 21 May 1659]

A clean and revised copy of the "register"—containing additional names, and information regarding a number of cloth ells that individuals and groups were to receive—was prepared in the Crown Treasury, most likely on 21 May, one day before the oath-taking ceremony in the Senate chamber. The register's new heading stated that the king and the senators had granted "honoraria" to the "Cossacks" at their leave-taking. The payment orders show that most of the cloth gifts were distributed on 10 June. The numbers added, before the names, correspond to those in Calculation 4. Large brackets, which appear in the document, have been omitted. Clean copy errors in names have been corrected.

Original, AGAD, ASK, od. III, RNK, ks. 5, fos. 755aʳ–755bᵛ.

[fo. 755aʳ]

Rejestr tych Kozaków,

którym KJM i ich miłościwi panowie senatorowie,
przy boku JKM na ten czas zostając, przy
odprawie honoraria naznaczyli.

Naprzód

[1]	Jm panu Konstantemu Wyhowskiemu	Tym czterem
[2]	Jm panu Tymoszowi Nosaczowi, oboźnemu	po łok. 12 aksamitu,
[3]	Jm panu Leśnickiemu, płk. mirhorodzkiemu	po łok. 12 atłasu weneckiego,
[4]	Jm panu Teodorowi Wyhowskiemu	po łok. 10 atłasu łukieskiego.

Potem

[5]	Jm panu Hruszy, pisarzowi generalnemu	łok. 27 aksamitu, [łok.] 52 atłasu weneckiego, łok. 24 atłasu łukieskiego.

Z osobna

Pułkownikom i setnikom z Wojska
do wykonania przysięgi deputowanym

Jako

[6]	z pułku czehryńskiego:	Pan Jaśko Wowczenko, set. kryłowski [Pan] Michajło Burmaka, set. śmiłowski
[7]	z czerkaskiego:	Pan Matwiej Odyniec, asauł pułkowy [Pan] Semen Dżułajenko, syn płk. czerkaskiego
[8]	z kaniowskiego:	[Pan] Waśko Mitczenko, set. kaniowski [Pan] Andrzej Butenko, płk przeszły kaniowski

[fo. 755a^{v}]

[9]	z korsuńskiego:	Pan Meleszko Tywonko, set. korsuński [Pan] Iwan Połowczenko
[10]	z perejasławskiego:	[Pan] Stefan Sulima, płk, akasamitu łok. 12, atłasu weneckiego łok. 12. [Pan] Andrzej Romanenko, tabinu łok. 6, atłasu weneckiego łok. 12.[7]
[11]	z białocerkiewskiego:	[Pan] Semen Łobuszenko, set. stawiski [Pan] Andrej Rudika, set. nastaski

[12]	z Kosza samego:	[Pan] Kiryło Andryjewicz, płk
		[Pan] Semen Cybulenko
		[Pan] Kryśko, pisarz koszowy
[13]	z niżyńskiego:	[Pan] Iwan Kosiński, set. wertijowski
		[Pan] Jakub Hulanicki
[14]	z mirhorodzkiego:	[Pan] Onyśko Tołstowicz, set. piskowski
		[Pan] Wasyl Skrebet, set. łochwicki
[15]	z humańskiego:	[Pan] Maksym Bułyha, set. ziatkowski
		[Pan] Hryhory Biłohrud, set. babański
[16]	z połtawskiego:	[Pan] Iwan Hrycuta, set. bahacki
		[Pan] Hryćko Zarudny
[17]	z czernihowskiego:	[Pan] Tymosz Nihowicz
		[Pan] Niczypor Hryhorowicz, set. siedniowski

[fo. 755b^{r}]

[18]	z pawołockiego:	[Pan] Iwan Fiłonenko, set. torczycki
		[Pan] Wasyl Petrowski, set. chodorkowski
[19]	z kalnickiego:	[Pan] Feśko Mikitenko, set. kalnicki
		[Pan] Feśko Dulski, set. iliński

Do tego

[20]	Dworzanie	[Pan] Ostap Fetkiewicz, zięć pana oboźnego
[21]	i słudzy	[Pan] Ostap Lejbenko, także zięć pana oboźnego
[22]	poselscy:	[Pan] Hryhory Hulanicki, trzeci zięć tegoż
[23]		[Pan] Stefan Doroszenko

[24] [Pan] Mikołaj Jaworski, kancelarysta wojskowy

[25] [Pan] Teodor Sulima

[26] [Pan] Kalin Sokołowski, set.

[27] [Pan] Iwan Bohatyrewicz, set.

[28] [Pan] Iwan Rudnicki

[29] [Pan] Hryhory Kotuszowski, set.

[30] [Pan] Kiryło Szyraj, set.

[31] Pan Wereszczaka, instygator

[32] [Pan] Gabriel Słoniewski

[33] [Pan] Samujło, set.

[34] [Panu] Aleksandrowi Nosarzewskiemu[8]

[35] [Panu] Mazepie[9]

[36] [Panu] Kolczyńskiemu[10]

[37] Słudzy Pan Graźny[11]

[38] hetmańscy: Pan Strzeszkowski[12]

Tym ordynowano po łok. 12 atłasu,
po łok. 12 adamaszku

[39] Panu Brzuchowieckiemu[13] tabinu łok. 6,
atłasu weneckiego łok. 6[14]

[fo. 755b^v] Przy tym

[40] Panu Jakubowi Nosaczenkowi,
synowi pana oboźnego
Temu naznaczono: łok. 24 atłasu i
łok. 24 adamaszku

Tudzież

[41] Jm panu Krzysztofowi Słoniewskiemu łok. 20 aksamitu

A na ostatek

Czeladzi różnych i Kozakom tychże posłów

Jako

[42]	Jm pana Konstantego Wyhowskiego	osób *no*	90
[43]	Jm pana Nosacza, oboźnego	osób *no*	180
[44]	Jm pana Niemierzyca	osób *no*	120
[45]	Jm pana Hruszy, pisarza generalnego	osób *no*	20
[46]	Pana Teodora Wyhowskiego	osób *no*	21
[47]	Pana płk. mirhorodzkiego[15]	osób *no*	30
[48]	Pana instygatora ruskiego[16]	osób *no*	4

Tym wszystkim ordynowano sukna po łok. 6.

Jan Hrusza, pisarz generalny
Wojska JKM Zaporoskiego, *mp*

4

[Warsaw, 26 May–14 June 1659]

A detailed calculation pertaining to the cost of the "honoraria" distributed in cloth among the diplomatic representatives of the Grand Duchy of Rus' and the Zaporozhian Host. Estimates of costs and dates of payment orders are listed in brackets. These relate to persons or groups whose documents are missing in the Crown Treasury records. Asterisks denote individuals who signed the text of the oath. The original document containing the text and signatures is located in the BCzart.[17] Printed versions of these signatures are often inaccurate. It should be noted that 1 zł = 30 gr, and 1 gr = 18 d.

	Names	Amounts zł	gr	Dated at Warsaw on	Sources
[1]	* K. Vyhovs'kyi	[396	20]	[10 June 1659]	
[2]	* T. Nosach	396	20	10 June 1659	AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 730.

	Names	Amounts zł	gr	Dated at Warsaw on	Sources
[3]	* H. Lisnyts'kyi	[396	20]	[10 June 1659]	
[4]	* F. Vyhovs'kyi	[396	20]	[10 June 1659]	
[5]	* I. Hrusha	[918	00]	[10 June 1659]	
[6]	*Ia. Vovchenko[18] *M. Burmaka	228	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 703.
[7]	*M. Odynets' *S. Dzhulaienko	[256	00]	[10 June 1659]	
[8]	*V. Mytchenko *A. Butenko	254	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 632.
[9]	*M. Tyronenko *I. Polovchenko	256	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 635.
[10]	*S. Sulyma *A. Romanenko	546	00	11 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 109.
[11]	*S. Lobasenko *A. Rudyka	242	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 675.
[12]	*K. Andrienko S. Tsybulenko *K. Lukashevych	342	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 731.
[13]	*I. Kosyns'kyi *Ia. Hulianyts'kyi	228	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 642.
[14]	*O. Tovstovych *V. Skrebets'	256	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 654.

	Names	Amounts zł	gr	Dated at Warsaw on	Sources
[15]	*M. Bulyha *H. Bilohrod	256	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 699.
[16]	*I. Hrytsuta *H. Zarudnyi	228	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 678.
[17]	*T. Nyhovych *N. Hryhorovych	242	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 650.
[18]	*I. Fylonenko[19] *V. Petrovs'kyi	242	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 663.
[19]	*F. Mykytenko[20] *F.Dul's'kyi	228	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 664.
[20]	* O. Fetskovych	114	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 651.
[21]	O. Leibenko	128	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 611.
[22]	H. Hulianyts'kyi	114	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 682.
[23]	S. Doroshenko	[114	00]	[10 June 1659]	
[24]	M. Iavors'kyi	128	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 700.
[25]	F. Sulyma	114	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 672.
[26]	* K. Sokolovs'kyi	[114	00]	[10 June 1659]	
[27]	* I. Bohatyrenko	[114	00]	[10 June 1659]	
[28]	I. Rudnyts'kyi	128	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 657.
[29]	H. Kotushovs'kyi	128	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 660.
[30]	K. Shyrai	128	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 659.

	Names	Amounts zł	gr	Dated at Warsaw on	Sources
[31]	* P. Vereshchaka	114	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 670.
[32]	H. Slonevs'kyi	192	15	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 687.
		28	00	14 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 576.
[33]	Samiilo	126	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 648.
[34]	O. Nosazhevs'kyi	112	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 688.
[35]	A. Mazepa	[114	00]	[10 June 1659]	
[36]	F. Kolchyns'kyi	142	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 673.
[37]	A. Graznyi	114	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 336.
[38]	H. Streskovs'kyi	114	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 749.
[39]	I. Briukhovets'kyi	182	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 684.
[40]	Ia. Nosach	256	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 746.
[41]	Kh. Slonevs'kyi	300	00	[10 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 679.
			Retinues of		
[42]	K. Vyhovs'kyi	288	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 607.
		594	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 624.
		757	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 676.
		306	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 737.
		[144	00][21]	[10 June 1659]	
[43]	T. Nosach	72	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 610.
		504	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 667.
		72	00	[10 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 734.
		96	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 736.
		[2,304	00][22]	[10 June 1659]	
[44]	Iu. Nemyrych	406	00	12 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 723.
		[171	00][23]	[10 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 385.
		[1,280	00][24]	[10 June 1659]	

	Names	Amounts zł	gr	Dated at Warsaw on	Sources
[45]	I. Hrusha	450	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 618.
[46]	F. Vyhovs'kyi	378	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 614.
[47]	H. Lisnyts'kyi	[540	00][25]	[10 June 1659]	
[48]	P. Vereshchaka	[72	00][26]	[10 June 1659]	
	Additional Payment Orders and Receipts				
[49]	M. Papkevych	140	00	26 May 1659	AGAD, ASK, od. IV, KR, ks. 14, fo. 789.
	H. Lysovs'kyi	[140	00]	27 May 1659	AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 105.
[50]	* Iu. Nemyrych	[1,175	00][27]	[10 June 1659]	
[51]	* I. Zarudnyi	[114	00]	[10 June 1659]	
[52]	L. Branyts'kyi	200	00	9 June 1659	AGAD, ASK, od. IV, KR, ks. 14, fo. 684.
[53]	S. Kuchyns'kyi	106	00	[10 June 1659]	AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 608.
[54]	I. Krasovs'kyi	106	00	[10 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 638.
[55]	I. Chekalovs'kyi	112	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 696.
[56]	D. Olivenberg	112	00	10 June 1659	Ibid., fo. 706.
[57]	M. Gunashevs'kyi	74	10	[10 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 733.
TOTAL		20,140	15		

5

Warsaw, 10 June 1659

An example of a payment order signed by Jacek Bianchi, senior Notary of the Crown Treasury, instructing Jan Cynaki, factor of the Crown Treasury, to issue 12 ells of satin and 6 ells of silk taffeta to eight persons from the retinue of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi. Each invidual confirmed the receipt of the cloth gift by his signature.

Original, AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 676.

[fo. 676r]

Mości panie Cynaki,

Wydaj wm panu Iwanowi Krzyżanowskiemu, panu Andrzejowi Wyhowskiemu, Semenowi Zahornemu, Iwanowi Kozłakowskiemu, Iwanowi Korszuńcowi, Janowi Wyhowskiemu, Jaśkowi Kochanowi[czowi], Kazimierzowi Pojeckiemu—wszystkim po łok. 12 atłasu łukieskiego a po 6 [łok.] tabinku w wodę. Co z skarbu Rzeczypospolitej koronnego wm zapłacono będzie. Na co się podpisuję. W Warszawie, *die* 10 *junii* 1659.

J. Bianchi

mp,[18] pisarz skarbu koronnego

Jan Wyhowski, odebrałem

Ja odebrałem, Jędrzej Wyhowski

Odebrałem, Kazimierz Pojecki

Odebrałem, Semen Nahirny

Iwan Korsuniec odebrał

Iwan Krzyżanowski, odebrałem

Iwan Kozłakowski, odebrałem

Jaśko Kochanowicz, odebrałem

[fo. 676v]

[Following the listing of names]

Kozakom zaporoskim *no* 8
dano bławatami z skarbu
fl 757

Stanisław Zaręba
sędzia województwa sandomierskiego[19]

fl 757

6

Warsaw, 3 June 1659

A statement signed by Mikołaj Prażmowski, Crown Grand Chancellor, and Bogusław Leszczyński, Crown Vice-Chancellor, confirming that Jan Kazimierz Krasiński, Crown Grand Treasurer, was formally authorized by the Senate to disburse a sum of 55,047 zł—the correct sum was actually 55,044 zł—in order to cover the expenses of various diplomatic missions which took part in the proceedings relating to the ratification of the Hadiach Treaty of Union in 1659.

Original, AGAD, ASK, od. IV, KR, ks. 14, fo. 300.

[fo. 300r]

Wiadomo czynię, komu to wiedzieć należy, iż jw jm pan Jan Kazimierz na Krasnym Krasiński, podskarbi wielki koronny *etc.*, wydał *iuxta senatus consulta*, na prowizyje posłów i posłanników Kozackich, którzy *in negotio pacis* od jm pana hetmana i Wojska wszytkiego Zaporoskiego na terazniejszy sejm zesłani byli. A mianowicie, na pana Konstantego Wyhowskiego, wespół z jm panem Jerzym Niemierzycem podkomorzym kijowskim, złp 21 000. Potym na pana Teodora Wyhowskiego zł 9 010. Na pana Nosacza oboźnego Wojska Zaporoskiego zł 12 000, temuż na odprawę zł 1 000. Na pana Hruszę zł zł [*sic*] 10 000. Panu Papkiewiczowi i Artlowskiemu[30] prowizyjej zł 900, a z osobna na drogę wysłanym do jm pana [Jana] Wyhowskiego, zł 400. *Similiter* panu Bazylemu Kropiwnickiemu, tamże wysłanemu, zł 600. A na ostatek panu Kazimirzowi Zużańskiemu, *itidem* do jm pana Wyhowskiego wysłanemu, zł 137.[31] Co wszytko *in unum* komputując *efficit summam* złp 55 047.[32] Która to suma, ponieważ jest *ex senatus consultis* takowym, co *et authenticis documentis docuit*, sposobem wydana, tedy też powinna będzie na przyszłych generalnych rachunkach jw jm panu podskarbiemu wielkiemu koronnemu być przyjęta. Na co się dla większej wagi i pewności własną podpisuję ręką.[33] W Warszawie, *die* 3 *iunii* 1659 *anno.*

Ksiądz Mikołaj Prażmowski
kanclerz wielki koronny
Bogusław na Lesznie [Leszczyński]
[podkanclerzy wielki koronny]

[fo. 300v]

Na prowizyje posłów i posłanników Kozackich, którzy *in negotio pacis* od jm pana hetmana i wszytkiego Wojska Zaporoskiego na sejm 1659 [roku] zesłani byli, wydał skarb [koronny] *iuxta senatus consultum fl* 55 047.

7

Toruń-Warsaw, 10 January–[3 June] 1659

A detailed calculation of the sums disbursed for diplomacy which are found in Document 6, including those, relevant for the same period, which are listed in other documents. Bracketed items contain estimates of sums and dates.

Names	Amounts zł	gr	Dates	Sources
V. Kropyvnyts'kyi	600	00	10 January 1659	AGAD, ASK, od. IV, KR, ks. 14, fo. 540r.
K. Zuzhans'kyi	134	00	2 April 1659	Ibid., ks. 15, fo. 89r.
┌M. Papkevych	900	00	[26 May] 1659	Ibid., ks. 1, fo. 520.
└H. Lysovs'kyi	400	00	27 May 1659	Ibid., ks. 15, fo. 92r.
K. Vyhovs'kyi	[7,500	00]	[3 June 1659]	Ibid., ks. 1, fo. 744r.
	[3,000	00]	[3 June 1659]	Ibid.
Iu. Nemyrych	[7,500	00]	[3 June 1659]	Ibid.
	[3,000	00]	[3 June 1659]	Ibid.
T. Nosach	12,000	00	[3 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 451r.
	1,000	00	[3 June 1659]	Ibid.
I. Hrusha	10,000	00	[3 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 219v.
F. Vyhovs'kyi	9,010	00	[3 June 1659]	Ibid., fo. 744r.
Total	55,044	00		

Names	Amounts zł.	gr.	Dates	Sources
		Other expenditures:		
K. Peretiatkowicz	400	00	12 April 1659	Ibid., ks. 14, fo. 685^r^.
M.. Butovych	45	00	13 April 1659	Ibid., fo. 686^r^.
┌Semiashenko ├S. Lisnyts'kyi └Ia. Somko[34]	600	00	13 April 1659	Ibid., fo. 744^r^.
O. Rodkevych	300	00	24 May 1659	Ibid., ks. 15, fo.80^r^.
Grand total	56,389	00		

8

Warsaw, 22 and 24 May 1659

A reproduction of the signatures, under the text of the oath, of the thirty-nine members of the delegation of the Grand Duchy of Rus' and the Zaporozhian Host during the ratification of the Hadiach Treaty of Union. With the exception of Iurii Nemyrych, who signed the document on 24 May, all other members signed it on the 22nd.

Original, BCzart., MS 402, pp. 250–251.

[illegible]

Иван Тарасенко [illegible]

[illegible] Кирило Андреенко [illegible]

Андрей [illegible]

Семен [illegible]

Андрей [illegible] Васил [illegible]

Иван [illegible]

[illegible]

251

Тимофей Микулин микулин сын Микитин Гри[illegible] Семенович Петров [illegible] Павлович Федор [illegible] Петров Пакин

Исаак Никитович [illegible] Сергей Петров [illegible]

Иван Солодовников [illegible] Иван Богатырев [illegible] рублев [illegible]

[illegible] тако писа[illegible]

[illegible]

APPENDICES

1

Abbreviations

Archives and Libraries

AGAD	Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (Warsaw)
AR	Archiwum Radziwiłłów (in AGAD)
ASK	Archiwum Skarbu Koronnego (in AGAD)
BCzart.	Biblioteka Czartoryskich (Cracow)
cz.	część
dz.	dział
fo.	folio
KA	Księgi Asygnacji (in ASK, od. VI)
KP	Księgi Pieczętne or Sigillata (in MK)
KR	Księgi Rekognicji (in ASK, od. IV)
ks.	księga
MK	Metryka Koronna (in AGAD)
ML	Tak zwana Metryka Litewska (in AGAD)
MS	Manuscript
od.	oddział
RMG	Recesy Miasta Gdańska (in WAPGd.)
RNK	Rachunki Nadworne Królów (ASK, od. III)
RS	Rachunki Sejmowe (in ASK, od. II)
RSZP	Recesy Stanów Zachodniopruskich (in WAPGd.)
RW	Rachunki Wojskowe (in ASK, od. 86)
t.	teka
WAPGd.	Wojewódzkie Archiwum Państwowe (Gdańsk)

Documents and Texts

d	denar (18 d = 1 gr)
fl	*florenus* = zł
gr	grosz (30 gr = 1 zł)
JKM	Jego Królewska Miłość
jm	jego miłość
KJM	Król Jego Miłość
łok.	łokieć (ell, a measure of length. The Warsaw ell = 59.5cm; the Cracow ell = 58.6 cm).
mości	(wasza) miłości

mp	*manu propria*
no	*numero*
płk	pułkownik
set.	setnik
sz.	sztuka (piece or length of cloth=ell)
zł	złoty (basic monetary unit)
złp	złoty polski
wm	wasza miłość

Published Primary Sources

AIuZR	*Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoiu komissieiu*, 15 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1861–92).
LNA	*Litterae Nuntiorum Apostolicorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes*, 14 vols. (Rome, 1959–77).
Materialy	*Materialy do istoriï kozachchyny XVII viku* (L'viv, 1994)[=vyp. 1 of *L'vivs'ki istorychni pratsi. Dzherela*; originally prepared by Vasyl' Harasymchuk (Herasymchuk), new ed. with introduction by Iaroslav Dashkevych et al.].
Pamiatniki (1st ed.)	*Pamiatniki, izdannye Vremennoiu komissieiu dlia razbora drevnikh aktov, vysochaishe uchrezhdennoiu pri Kievskom voennom, Podol'skom, i Volynskom general-gubernatore*, 4 vols. (Kiev, 1845–59).
Pamiatniki (2nd ed.)	*Pamiatniki, izdannye Kievskoiu komissieiu dlia razbora drevnikh aktov*, 3 vols. (Kiev, 1898).
VL	*Volumina Legum*. 8 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1859–60; reprint, Warsaw, 1980).

2

Names, Offices, Ranks, Titles, and Relationships

This list relates only to persons who represented the Grand Duchy of Rus' and the Zaporozhian Host. Military terms and ranks have been translated as follows: *Viis'ko Zaporiz'ke*—Zaporozhian Host, *polk*—regiment, *sotnia*—company, *polkovnyk*—colonel, *sotnyk*—captain, *pysar*—secretary, *suddia*—judge, *osaul*—aide-de-camp, *oboznyi*—quartermaster, *kantseliaryst*—clerk, and *kapelian*—chaplain. Due to a difficulty in translation, the commander-in-chief of the Zaporozhian Host will be referred to as *hetman*. Civil offices are rendered as follows: *kantsler*—chancellor, *voievoda*—palatine.

Andrienko, Kyrylo: Colonel of the Kish, Zaporozhian Sich.
Balaban, Dionysii: Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev (1657–1663).
Bilohrod, Hyrhorii: Captain of Babanka Company, Uman' Regiment.
Bilohrud, Hryhorii: see Bilohrod, Hryhorii.
Bohatyrenko, Ivan: Captain of Korostyshiv Company, (Kiev Regiment?).[35]
Bohatyrevych, Ivan: see Bohatyrenko, Ivan.
Bohdanovych-Zarudnyi, Ivan: see Zarudnyi, Ivan.
Bohdanovych-Zarudnyi, Samiilo: see Zarudnyi, Samiilo.
Branyts'kyi, Liudovyk: Chamberlain of Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi.
Briukhovets'kyi, Ivan: future Hetman of Left Bank Ukraine (1663–1668).
Bulyha-Kurtsevych, Maksym: Captain of Ziatkivtsi Company, Uman' Regiment.
Burmaka, Mykhailo: Captain of Smila Company, Chyhyryn Regiment.
Butenko, Andrii: former Colonel of Kaniv Regiment (1655–1657).
Butovych, Mykhailo: member of Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi's household.
Chekalovs'kyi, Ivan: Secretary of the Zaporozhian Host.
Doroshenko, Petro: Colonel of Pryluky Regiment, future Hetman of Right Bank Ukraine (1665–1676).
Doroshenko, Stepan: brother of Petro.
Drabovych, Hryhorii: member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Dul's'kyi, Fes'ko: Captain of Illintsi Company, Kal'nyk Regiment.
Dzhulai, Fedir: Colonel of Cherkasy Regiment.
Dzhulai, Semen: see Dzhulaienko, Semen.
Dzhulaienko, Semen: son of Fedir Dzhulai, serving in Cherkasy Regiment.
Fed'kovych, Ostap: see Fetskovych, Ostap.
Fetskovych, Ostap: Assistant Secretary of Zaporozhian Host, attendant of Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi and son-in-law of Tymish Nosach.
Fylonenko, Ivan: Captain of Torchytsia Company, Pavoloch Regiment (perhaps the same person as Ivan Khylchenko).
Garbada, Voitekh: perhaps a member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Graznyi, Andrii: attendant of Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi.
Gunashevs'kyi, Mykhailo: Archpriest of Kiev, Chaplain of Zaporozhian Host.
Hraznyi, Andrii: see Graznyi, Andrii.
Hrusha, Ivan: Secretary-General of Zaporozhian Host.

Hryhorovych, Nychypir: Captain of Sedniv Company, Chernihiv Regiment.
Hulianyts'kyi, Iakiv: brother of Hryhorii (colonel), serving in Nizhyn Regiment.
Hulianyts'kyi, Hryhorii: Colonel of Nizhyn Regiment.
Hulianyts'kyi, Hryhorii: son-in-law of Tymish Nosach.
Hunashevs'kyi, Mykhailo: see Gunashevs'kyi, Mykhailo.
Hrytsuta, Ivan: Captain of Bahachka Company, Poltava Regiment.
Iavors'kyi, Mykhailo: Clerk of Zaporozhian Host.
Khylchenko, Ivan: Captain of Torchytsia Company, Pavoloch Regiment (perhaps the same person as Ivan Fylonenko).
Kokhanovych, Ias'ko: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.
Kolchyns'kyi, Fedir: listed under "courtiers and servants of the envoys."
Kolienda, Havryïl: Archeparch of Polatsk (Byzantine rite, in union with the Holy See), later Metropolitan (1665–1674).
Korsunets', Ivan: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.
Kosyns'kyi, Ivan: Captain of Vertiïvka Company, Nizhyn Regiment.
Kotushovs'kyi, Hryhorii: Captain in Myrhorod Regiment.
Kozlakovs'kyi, Ivan: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.
Krasovs'kyi, Osyp: Captain.
Kropyvnyts'kyi, Vasyl': Assistant Secretary of Zaporozhian Host and envoy.
Kryzhanovs'kyi, Ivan: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.
Kuchyns'kyi, Stepan: Aide-de-Camp of Turaŭ (Turiv) Regiment.
Kurylovych, Danylo: perhaps a member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Leibenko, Ostap: son-in-law of Tymish Nosach.
Lesnyts'kyi, Hryhorii: see Lisnyts'kyi, Hryhorii.
Lesnyts'kyi, Samiilo: see Lisnyts'kyi, Samiilo.
Lisnyts'kyi, Hryhorii: Colonel of Myrhorod Regiment.
Lisnyts'kyi, Samiilo: diplomatic envoy sent to Warsaw by Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi.
Lobasenko, Semen: Captain of Stavyshche Company, Bila Tserkva Regiment.
Lysovs'kyi, Havrylo: Aide-de-Camp-General of Zaporozhian Host.
Mazepa-Kolednys'kyi, Adam: brother of Ivan, the future Hetman (1687–1709).
Mlekyts'kyi, Khrystof: perhaps a member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Molodianovs'kyi, Ulas [?]: perhaps a member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Mykytenko, Fes'ko: Captain of Kal'nyk Company, Kal'nyk Regiment (perhaps the same person as Fes'ko Panchenko).
Mytchenko, Vas'ko: Captain of Kaniv Company, Kaniv Regiment.
Nahirny, Semen: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.
Nechevych, Iarosh: member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Nemyrych, Iurii: Chamberlain of Kiev and Hetman Ivan Vhyovs'kyi's nominee for the office of Grand Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Rus'.
Nosach, Iakiv: see Nosachenko, Iakiv.
Nosach, Tymish: Quartermaster-General of Zaporozhian Host.
Nosachenko, Iakiv: son of Tymish.
Nosazhevs'kyi, Oleksander: listed under household members and attendants of the envoys.
Nyhovych-Liakhovyts'kyi, Tymish: Secretary of Chernihiv Regiment.
Odynets', Matvii: Aide-de-Camp of Cherkasy Regiment.
Olivenberg, Danylo: Secretary of Zaporozhian Host, diplomat of Greek origin.

Panchenko, Fes'ko: Captain in Kal'nyk Regiment (perhaps the same person as Fes'ko Mykytenko).
Papkevych, Matiiash: Colonel of Irkliïv Regiment.
Patskevych, Matiiash: see Papkevych, Matiiash.
Petrovs'kyi, Vasyl': Captain of Khodorkiv Company, Pavoloch Regiment.
Poets'kyi, Kazymyr: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.
Polovchenko, Ivan: Captain in Korsun' Regiment.
Postolovs'kyi, Stepan: perhaps a member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Rodkevych, Oleksander: a diplomatic envoy returning from Warsaw to Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi.
Romanenko, Andrii: Judge of Pereiaslav Regiment.
Rudnyts'kyi, Ivan: Secretary of Myrhorod Regiment.
Rudyka, Andrii: Captain of Nastashka Company, Bila Tserkva Regiment.
Samiilo: Captain.
Semiashenko, Ivan: diplomatic envoy sent to Warsaw by Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi.
Shostakovs'kyi, Vasyl': Captain, member of Iurii Nemyrych's retinue.
Shyrai, Kyrylo: Captain in Myrhorod Regiment.
Skrebetov, Vasyl': see Skrebets', Vasyl'.
Skrebets', Vasyl': Captain of Lokhvytsia Company, Myrhorod Regiment.
Slonevs'kyi, Havryïl: attendant of Ivan Hrusha.
Slonevs'kyi, Khrystof: merchant of Armenian origin, frequently employed in diplomatic service.[36]
Sokolovs'kyi, Kalyn: Captain of Zhytomyr Company, (Kiev Regiment?).[37]
Somko, Iakym: future Colonel of Pereiaslav Regiment (1660–1662) and Acting Hetman of Left Bank Ukraine (1660–1663), brother-in-law of Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi (1648–1657) and uncle of future Hetman Iurii Khmel'nyts'kyi (1659–1663).
Sostachenko, Vasyl': see Shostakovs'kyi, Vasyl'.
Streskovs'kyi, Hryhorii: attendant of Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi.
Sulyma, Fedir: listed under household members and attendants of the envoys.
Sulyma, Stepan: Colonel of Pereiaslav Regiment.
Taranchenko, Ias'ko: Captain of Kryliv Company, Chyhyryn Regiment (perhaps the same person as Ias'ko Vovchenko).
Teteria-Morzhkovs'kyi, Pavlo: former Colonel of Pereiaslav Regiment (1653–1658); future Secretary-General (1660–1663) and Hetman of Right-Bank Ukraine (1663–1665). Through his two marriages he was related to Hetmans Ivan Vyhovs'kyi and Iurii Khmel'nyts'kyi.
Tovstovych, Onys'ko, Captain of Pishchane Company, Myrhorod Regiment.
Tsybulenko, Semen: Captain of the Kish, Zaporozhian Sich.
Tyronenko, Meleshko: Captain of Korsun' Company, Korsun' Regiment.
Tyvonenko, Meleshko: see Tyronenko, Meleshko.
Varteresovych-Slonevs'kyi, Havryïl: see Slonevs'kyi, Havryïl.
Varteresovych-Slonevs'kyi, Khrystof: see Slonevs'kyi, Khrystof.
Vereshchaka, Prokip: Land Surveyor of Chernihiv, Royal Secretary and Attorney-General of the Grand Duchy of Rus'.
Vovchenko, Ias'ko: Captain of Kryliv Company, Chyhyryn Regiment (perhaps the same person as Ias'ko Taranchenko).
Vyhovs'kyi, Andrii: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.

Vyhovs'kyi, Fedir: cousin of Ivan (Hetman).
Vyhovs'kyi, Ivan: Hetman of Zaporozhian Host (1657–1659), Grand Hetman of the Grand Duchy of Rus' and Palatine of Kiev.
Vyhovs'kyi, Ivan: member of Kostiantyn Vyhovs'kyi's retinue.
Vyhovs'kyi, Kostiantyn: Colonel of Turaŭ (Turiv) Regiment and brother of Ivan (Hetman).[38]
Zarudnyi, Hryhorii: Captain of Stari Sanzhary Company, Poltava Regiment.
Zarudnyi, Ivan: son of Samiilo.
Zarudnyi, Samiilo: Judge-General of Zaporozhian Host.
Zuzhans'kyi, Kazymyr: diplomatic courier of Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi.

NOTES

1. Iurii Nemyrych.
2. The next three items were added, most likely, by Slonevs'kyi.
3. Mykhailo Gunashevs'kyi. See AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fos. 733r, 734r.
4. The following seven lines were added by a third hand.
5. The following seven lines were added, most likely, by Slonevs'kyi.
6. Since this is in the singular, Leszczyński must have been required to add his signature at a later date.
7. For item [10] the number of ells and the type of cloth were added in another handwriting.
8. Items [34], [35] and [36] were added in the same handwriting as that in n. 7.
9. Adam Mazepa. See *VL* 4:304.
10. Fedir Kolchyns'kyi. See AGAD, AKW, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 673r.
11. Andrii Graznyi. See ibid., fo. 636r.
12. Hryhorii Streskovs'kyi. See ibid., fo. 749r.
13. Ivan Briukhovets'kyi. See ibid., fo. 684r.
14. Item [39] was added in the same handwriting as that in nn. 7 and 8.
15. Hryhorii Lisnyts'kyi.
16. Prokip Vereshchaka. See AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 670r.
17. See Document 8.
18. Ias'ko Vovchenko, Captain of Kryliv Company, signed the payment order on 10 June 1659. See AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 703r. Ias'ko Taranchenko, also Captain of Kryliv Company, signed the text of the oath on 22 May 1659. See BCzart., MS 402, p. 250, and Document 8. Either there were two Kryliv Companies in the Chyhyryn Regiment, or one person was identified by two different surnames.
19. Ivan Fylonenko, Captain of Torchytsia Company, signed the payment order on 10 June 1659. See AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 663r. Ivan Khyl'chenko, also Captain of Torchytsia Company, signed the text of the oath on 22 May 1659. See BCzart., MS 402, p. 250, and Document 8. Again, either there were two Torchytsia Companies in the Pavoloch Regiment, or one person was identified by two different surnames.
20. Fes'ko Mykytenko, Captain of Kal'nyk Company, signed the payment order on 10 June 1659. See AGAD, ASK, od. VI, KA, ks. 6, fo. 664r. The text of the oath was signed by Fes'ko Panchenko (without the indication of his rank), who represented the Kal'nyk Regiment. See BCzart., MS 402, p. 250, and Document 8. Once again, it is difficult to determine whether this is a reference to one person or to two individuals.
21. Calculated at 24 persons x 6 zł.
22. Calculated at 120 persons x 18 zł., and 24 persons x 6 zł.
23. Calculated at 47 "cossacks" x 3 zł., and 5 "elders" x 6 zł.

24. Calculated at 64 persons x 20 zł.

25. Calculated at 30 persons x 18 zł.

26. Calculated at 4 persons x 18 zł.

27. Calculated at 20,140 zł 15 gr - 18,965 zł 15 gr.

28. Due to the difficulty of reading Bianchi's ornate character, I am uncertain that this is the correct abbreviation.

29. A member of the House of Envoys from the Palatinate of Sandomierz, who also served as an auditor of the Crown Treasury accounts.

30. This is a mistake which undoubtedly arose from the incorrect entry in the Crown Treasury. It should have been listed as follows: Panu Papkiewiczowi pułkownikowi irklejewskiemu i panu Lisowskiemu asaułowi wojskowemu.

31. The total should be 134 zł, as is evident from the signed statement of Zuzhans'kyi—i.e., two weeks at 67 zł per week. See AGAD, ASK, od. IV, KR, ks. 15, fo. 89r.

32. Due to the error of 3 zł (see n. 31), the grand total should be 55,044 zł.

33. See n. 6.

34. See *Pamiatniki* (2nd ed.) 3, pt. 3, 439. Here he is refereed to as Samczenko (see also *VL* 4:304), and Somchenko in *AIuZR* 4:217.

35. If Lypyns'kyi's view that there were also representatives from the Kiev Regiment is correct (see Lipiński, "Dwie chwile," 608, n. 1), then the Korostyshiv Company belonged to the Kiev Regiment in 1659.

36. Iaroslav Dashkevych has shed some new light on the identity of Slonevs'kyi. See his "Armenians in the Ukraine at the Time of Hetman Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj (1648–1657)," in *Eucharisterion: Essays presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979–1980), pt. 1, 173–74 [=*Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3–4]. See also Wdowiszewski, *Regesty nobilitacji*, 69, 76.

37. See n. 35. For the same reason, the Zhytomyr Company must have been part of the Kiev Regiment in 1659.

38. For more details about the Vyhovs'kyi family see V. Seniutovych-Berezhnyi, "Rid i rodyna Vyhovs'kykh (Istorychno-rodovidna rozvidka)," *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk* 7, no. 1–3 (1970): 149–67.

ESSAY

Ukrainian Literature and the Erotics of Postcolonialism: Some Modest Propositions

MARKO PAVLYSHYN

In addressing the subject of this paper—a phenomenon in contemporary Ukrainian literature—it is useful first to draw attention to related developments in the extraliterary context—in the culture of everyday life. In the wake of practically complete cultural liberalization (by about 1990), of national sovereignty and then independence (in 1991), there have been great (though, perhaps, not profound) changes in what ordinary people apprehend as they go about their daily lives or absorb the communications of the print and electronic media. The political messages that circulate in the Ukrainian public sphere in the early 1990s are characterized by plethoric variety. The public discourse on history, culture, and current affairs is diversified and gives voice to competing points of view. Some areas of human experience, largely overlooked or suppressed in the Soviet decades, have received a new prominence. Religion, in addition to attracting many new active participants, has become an object of general public attention, as has the activity of more or less eccentric religious cults. The domain of the parapsychological, and the activity of those who claim to be its adepts, have received wide media attention. Of special interest to us, finally, is the new exposure of the ordinary person to the sexual—as information, as image, and as a component of a great many communications in the public arena.

The emerging culture of television broadcasting permits and encourages a moderate amount of nudity on the screen. Locally made films and television shows, few as they are, contain practically obligatory scenes incorporating female nudity. A substantial proportion of the daily press and of general-interest periodicals carries reportage of sexual issues, as well as sexually titillating stories, with the corresponding illustrative material. There is even an embryonic specialized sex-oriented press: *Lel'*, a journal described in its subtitle as a "Ukrainian erotic journal," is available in many news kiosks, and *Pan i pani*, a newspaper dedicated mainly to contact ads, is published in Ternopil'. Illustrated sex-education books for children have become available, as has a range of manuals for adults (including such international classics as the *Kama Sutra*). Popular fiction, imported from

Russia or printed in Russian in Ukraine, favors soft-core pornography almost as much as it does sentimental romance: novel versions of the various *Emmanuelle* films are abundant, though not as abundant as novel versions of Mexican and other Latin American soap operas. The Polish edition of *Playboy* and Western men's magazines are generally available, though at very high prices, at news kiosks. Representatives of high culture, too, have signalled a growing interest in the erotic through such publications as *Bila knyha kokhannia* (*The White Book of Love*), an anthology of twentieth-century Ukrainian erotic verse that places such classics as Emma Andiievs'ka and Maksym Ryl's'kyi alongside such newcomers as Oleksandr Bryhynets' and Mstyslava Chaika.[1]

The extent to which the new availability of the sexually explicit corresponds to actual changes in social and sexual behavior has not yet been studied in an authoritative way. It is too early to say whether the phenomena enumerated above are symptoms of a "sexual revolution," or merely facets of a transitory mimicry of an easily-imitated Western phenomenon. The common-sense explanation that enjoys a certain currency in Ukraine and the West detects here a return of the repressed at the level of a society: there is a pent-up interest in the sexual, the consequence of the taboo placed upon the entire subject during the Soviet years; after a brief period of intense interest, the visibility of the sexual among the other concerns of the public sphere will subside.[2] It is possible, indeed, that in the sphere of intimate sexual relations, the situation today may not differ very greatly from the one described by Mikhail Shtern in 1980. Shtern observed a low level of openness about sex within the family, a high level of juvenile sexual activity unsanctioned by public morality, a substantial level of sexual disorders, and considerable sexual license by the privileged of both sexes.[3]

We are interested here in a narrower band of questions: first, in the evolution (if any) of the role of sexual material and its erotic use in literature and the literary process, and second, in these phenomena as they relate to changes in the colonial power relations that affect Ukrainian culture. The term "erotics," used in the title, we shall apply broadly, to cover the sum of sexual issues, preoccupations, values, myths and signs that occur in literary texts; the system of conventions governing the literary representation of the sexual; and the strategies in literary texts which may be observed, as one Australian critic has put it, to "summon readers as active agents, as cocreative participants in an unfinished act of desire."[4]

The fact that much of the material to be presented here comes from the period after the declaration of Ukrainian independence should not be taken to imply that the term "postcolonial" in this essay has a simply chronological meaning. I have sought elsewhere, against a background of widespread, but unstable, critical use of the term "postcolonial," to establish typological distinctions between the colonial, the anticolonial and the postcolonial in culture. As "colonial" I have understood those cultural phenomena which may be interpreted as promoting and maintaining the structures and myths of colonial power relations, and as "anticolonial"—those which directly challenge (or seek to invert) such relations. The

attribute "postcolonial" I have regarded as applicable to those entities in culture which signal an awareness of the relativity both of the term "colonialism" and of its negation, and which benefit from this relativity—in the work of art through exploring the consequences of the simultaneous historical availability of the heritage of the colonial and anticolonial, without any obligation to confirm or deny either, and with every right to play with both.[5]

Finally, by referring in my subtitle to "modest propositions" I mean to underscore the predominantly observational, descriptive character of what follows. It is not my intention to propose a single explanatory model for the new phenomenon of eroticism in Ukrainian literature, but to illustrate the relation to coloniality and postcoloniality of the following: (a) the "eroticization" of the older generation of writers; (b) the emergence of sexually titillating writing in the nonnormative mixture of Russian and Ukrainian known as *surzhyk*; (c) the centrality of the erotic, as a dimension of the carnivalesque, in the works and activity of "Bu-ba-bu" and other antitraditionalist groupings and movements; (d) the construction of a myth of L'viv as the focus of the erotic; and (e) the dominance of the male perspective in the new erotics and the corresponding underrepresentation of the perspective of women.

One of the surprising facts about the new literary fashion for the erotic is that it has been enthusiastically embraced by established writers of the literary mainstream: Pavlo Zahrebel'nyi (born 1924), Ievhen Hutsalo (1937–1995) and Valerii Shevchuk (born 1939), to name the best known.[6] The thick literary journals, often accused of stick-in-the-mud traditionalism, have practically competed with each other to publish sexually provocative works. Hryhorii Klochek, seeking to explain this phenomenon in *Literaturna Ukraïna*, has seen as its cause the "heavy, chilling breath of His Majesty the Market": the journals need sensation, furnished by such themes as Stalinist repressions, the Famine of 1932–33, and the lives of the party bosses—themes that journalism handles better than does literature. The habits of socialist realism have made it difficult for writers to address with authority or imagination the fundamentally new political and social realities that have emerged. Thus, more or less for lack of convincing alternatives, many established writers have been tempted to experiment with the erotic.

The stereotypical view, maintained here by Klochek, that Soviet literature had been "demonstratively holier-than-thou,"[7] is not strictly accurate, especially as regards literature of the 1970s. However, the foregrounding of the erotic and the construction of plots around sexual adventure is certainly an innovation.

Pavlo Zahrebel'nyi had used the erotic interestingly even in the bad old days of Brezhnevist-Suslovist stagnation. His historical novel *Ia, Bohdan* (1983) had, among many other unconventional features, a representation of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi not only as a sophisticated intellectual, but as a man of considerable, and complicated, libido. One of Zahrebel'nyi's recent short novels, *Hola dusha* (*Bare Soul*, 1992), subtitled "Confession to a Dictaphone," is narrated as the autobiography of a woman party functionary who has risen from train conductress

to a high post in the culture administration through the use of the bed. The didactic and moral framework remains conventional: the practice of sex as depicted is to be seen as deviant and as part of a symptomatology of the systemic misuse of power by the party-state elite. While readers are offered the intrigue of sexual adventure for their readerly pleasure, the depiction of sex itself is the depiction of rape:

> Навіть уві сні ввижалися мені короткопалі Кібцеві руки, пожадливо тягнулися до мене, зривали з мене одіж, нахабно, безсоромно обмацували моє голе тіло, добираючись до душі.
>
> Even in my dreams I could see Kibchyk's short-fingered hands greedily stretching towards me, tearing off my clothes, aggressively and shamelessly feeling at my naked body, getting at my soul.[8]

More inclined to tickle the reader with sexual sensation is Ievhen Hutsalo's *Blud* (*Error*, 1993), a book of short and very short anecdotes concerning sexual situations and adventures in all possible social, professional, age, and gender settings. One cannot overcome the impression that Hutsalo, described in the publisher's preface as "continuing Apuleius and Boccaccio on Ukrainian ground,"[9] intends to liquidate this blind spot of Ukrainian literature once and for all. Hutsalo is reasonably explicit both in the situations he describes and the language he uses. The reader is postulated as participating as the listening partner in a confidential conversation. The various situations are presented, not as essays in erotic fantasy, but rather as evidence of the plausibility, even in the sexual domain, of the extraordinary—an effect strengthened by the fact that many of the anecdotes advert to such up-to-the-minute social realities as the Krishna cult, the new class of small-scale over-the-border traders, or the growing number of women who decide to have children outside of a stable relationship. None of this would seem to justify the collection's subtitle, *Ukraïna: rozpusta i vyrodzhennia* (*Ukraine: dissipation and perversion*). Hutsalo's encyclopedia of sexual possibility reads, rather, as a frankly realistic corrective to the idealized (indeed, sentimental) image of social life in Ukraine as hitherto represented by the tradition of socialist realism. Furthermore, this nonmythological account serves as a corrective to Hutsalo's own earlier excursion into the theme of the Ukrainian erotic in his novel *Pozychenyi cholovik* (*The Borrowed Husband*, 1981). There, the libidinal economy had included a thoroughbred calf as the security against which the hero is lent by his wife to another collective-farm woman. This plot situation, of course, formed part of the intrinsically colonial equation of the Ukrainian with the rural, the provincial and the comically grotesque, familiar since Gogol's *Vechera na khutore bliz Dikan'ki* and *Mirgorod*.[10] Hutsalo's new work avoids this particular form of colonial self-deprecation.

Of the prose writers who had begun their careers in the 1960s, it was Valerii Shevchuk who, in the historical novels that appeared after his ten-year silence

during the 1970s, developed the most sophisticated postcolonial argumentation of the pre-independence period. These novels are not by any means works of erotic literature. It is not without interest, however, that they formulate questions of sex and gender in such a way that they become issues of coloniality. Anna Berehulak has argued that in the novel *Dim na hori* (*The House on the Hill*, 1983) Shevchuk constructs and then resolves a mythical tension between female and male (the generations of women who inhabit the House vs. the male incubi who tempt and sometimes seduce them) in a way that may be read as a postcolonial reconciliation and transcendence of monologic colonial and anticolonial positions.[11] In *Try lystky za viknom* (*Three Leaves outside the Window*, 1986) Shevchuk engages in a grand postcolonial strategy to recuperate, not so much the dignity and authority, as the vibrancy and interest for the present of Ukrainian culture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while constructing an elaborate anticolonial satire directed at the Russian Empire of the nineteenth century and, by metonymic extension, at the USSR. As part of the latter project, Shevchuk makes one of the narrators, Satanovs'kyi, a voyeur. The activity of this grotesquely loyal (and demonic) servant of empire, while bringing him pleasure and excitement, doubles as gathering information useful to the authorities. In the prison-house of empire, the novel's argument goes, even the most intimate human sphere is perniciously colonized by the power of the state.[12]

In his more recent works Shevchuk has had no alternative but to abandon the insinuative political ambiguities of Aesopian language: encoded meanings have little utility in an open cultural situation. A direct appeal to popular taste—or what is widely assumed to be popular taste—seems more appropriate in the prevailing cultural situation than a continued pursuit of sophistication and structural complexity. "Shevchuka potiahnulo na seks" (Shevchuk gets a taste for sex), proclaims a reviewer's headline, not without justification.[13] The audience, previously construed as sensitive to the merest nuance of subtextual meaning, is now reimagined as dominated rather single-mindedly by male libido. In the short novel *Misiatseva zozul'ka iz lastiv'iachoho hnizda* (*The Moon-Faced Cuckoo from the Swallow's Nest*, 1992) Shevchuk offers his readers, presumably for their (masculine) delectation, the stereotype of an unintelligent but manipulative woman; the notion of a woman distributing her sexual favors independent of social inhibition, but on the basis of a well-understood fee-for-service arrangement; and, above all, he offers his readers large breasts:

> Юлька була мала [...], із низькопосадженими клубами над карачкуватими ногами, з несподівано великими, аж випирали вони з одежі, грудьми [...].

> У вільний час вона відчиняла вікно, присовувала до нього стільця [...], сідала, клала пишні перса, аж вивалювалися вони із блузки, на підвіконня й засинала чи завмирала [...]; при цьому була Юлька така непорушно-відсторонена, що всяк із чоловіків, котрий проходив мимо, неодмінно повертав у її бік фізію [...].

Iul'ka was short [...], she had low-set hips and was bow-legged, but she had unexpectedly large breasts that practically pushed their way out of her clothes [...].

In her spare time she would open the window, bring up a chair [...], sit down and place her generous breasts, bursting out of her blouse, on the window sill; then she would fall asleep or go into a trance [...]; at such times she was so immobile and distant that any man passing could not help turning his face in her direction [...].[14]

A certain pleasure of the text is generated when Shevchuk combines the intention of erotic titillation with his well-proven mastery of humorous irony and fantastic invention. Iul'ka has offered one of her admirers sexual reward if he furnishes her newly-erected porch with a door. But the door must first be stolen from a building containing many households, and therefore a moment must be found for the theft when the attention of all the inhabitants is simultaneously diverted:

Отож треба було й потрапити в той сакраментальний мент, коли діти спали, а чоловіки дружно й майже водночас підгортали під себе жінок. Тоді весь Білий дім починав ходити ходором, ніби колихав його землетрус, бо всі працювали в одному ритмі й одночасно.

So it was essential to hit upon that precise sacramental moment when the children were already asleep and the men collegially and almost simultaneously tucked their wives beneath them. Then the entire White House would begin to vibrate as though shaken by an earthquake, for everyone worked to a single rhythm.[15]

On the whole, the erotic as treated by the established writers of the older generation is not an integral element of an evolving aesthetic paradigm. At worst, the erotic is treated as an object of literary speculation: some authors resort to it in what seems a desperate attempt to retain or attract readers. In the case of Shevchuk, the introduction of the erotic is accompanied by what some might regard as troubling concessions to the lightweight and the middle-brow without a compensatory leap into the genuinely popular. Furthermore, the new erotics of the middle-aged does not engage in any substantive way with power relations linked to coloniality.

An exception to this generalization, which, however, proves the rule, is Shevchuk's short novel *Kartyna bez ramky na holii stini* (*An Unframed Picture on a Bare Wall*, 1991), where, while dealing with the ever-piquant themes of infant eroticism and the sexual education of an ingenu, Shevchuk strays by accident into a discussion of the fascinating issue of *surzhyk* and colonial relations. The first-person narrator (innocent, naive, a child, Ukrainian-speaking and therefore rural) encounters girls from the city (knowing, sexually advanced and experienced and, of course, speakers of a *surzhyk* practically identical with Russian). Their communication turns to matters of sex:

—Ну от, шо дєлають женщіни і мужчини, знаїш?

Я звільнився з обіймів старшої, бо мені аж млосно ставало, і подивився на них баранчиком. З другого боку, мені було з ними так цікаво, що я аж тремтів. Мій маленький розумець наказував мені покинути цих юних безсоромниць, але я в цій ситуації собі не належав: вони оволоділи моєю волею беззастережно.

"Well then, do you know what grown-up men and women do together?"

I freed myself from the embrace of the elder one, for I was feeling faint, and I looked at them like a little lamb. On the other hand, it was so exciting to be with them that I was actually trembling. My little brain ordered me to run from these shameless young creatures, but in this situation I did not belong to myself: they had captured my will absolutely.[16]

The function which *surzhyk* primarily serves in this story is that of a satirical device to render unsympathetic those who have discarded their native language. But in the passage quoted above, the use of *surzhyk* transforms the situation into an allegory of the colonial power disbalance: the intruders from outside have seniority, knowledge, and aura; the native is irresistibly seduced by the promise of access to a greater and more advanced world than the one currently spanned by his "little brain," which *a priori* seems to him inferior. This triumph of cultural colonialism is underscored by metaphors drawn from colonialism both economic ("I no longer belonged to myself") and political ("they captured my *volia* [the word means both 'will' and 'freedom'] absolutely").

Surzhyk is the outcome of a colonization of language and the most palpable and ubiquitous social proof of the reality and depth of the cultural colonization of Ukraine. It is the communicative medium of individuals who speak neither normative Ukrainian nor correct Russian. It goes without saying that *surzhyk* offends anticolonial purists like Serhii Plachynda, who have invested considerable energies in publicistic campaigns to keep the Ukrainian language free of Russian borrowings or calques. They have done so for excellent anticolonial reasons: to maintain the distinctness and authenticity of the language, which by unquestioned consensus is the most important marker of Ukrainian national identity, and to affirm the value and authority of the native idiom in opposition to the language of empire—something that would be impossible unless the boundaries between the two were fixed and energetically policed.

However, linguistic purism has not been able to control the reduction of the number of social spheres in which the Ukrainian language is standardly employed, nor of the number of stylistic registers actually in use. The scatological domain and the specialized low-life argots of, for example, L'viv's prewar criminal classes have atrophied. Some members of the younger generation of writers have recognized that, de facto, these gaps are filled in real life by *surzhyk*, and have chosen to make its creative employment an important tactic in their aesthetic strategy. The very use of *surzhyk* as the medium for whole literary works is a kick at the anticolonial sacred cow of *solov'ina mova* (nightingale language). As an imitation of actual majority language practice, *surzhyk* possesses vernacular naturalness and vibrancy. Because it parodies two norms simultaneously, it is a

splendid vehicle for humor. Last but not least, it is just as much an anticolonial revenge upon the authority of the Russian language as it is a sign of the colonized status of the Ukrainian.

It is scarcely surprising that the literary use of *surzhyk*, with its carnivalesque dimension of illicit, but life-giving, coupling and contamination, should go hand-in-hand with erotic themes. Effectively the same combination was enacted in Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi's *Eneida* (1798–1842), where a vernacular barbaric in relation to established literary languages, but endowed for that reason with freshness and vitality, was used to formulate a carnivalesque universe of which sex is as much a part as is laughter. Bohdan Zholdak's *Surzhykovi istoriï* (*Surzhyk Tales*), which have appeared in the highly scandalous Zhytomyr journal *Avzhezh* and on the no less provocative culture pages of the L'viv newspaper *PostPostup*, are cases in point. Zholdak's story "Bol' sertsia materi" ("The Pain of a Mother's Heart," 1992), for example, is an hilarious account of the ambiguous "agony" enjoyed by a woman as she observes, from her secret vantage-point inside a wardrobe, the sexual acrobatics of her son with persons of both sexes.[17] It is also an amused footnote to the hyperserious image in Ukrainian literature of the mother-son relationship, which has enjoyed mythical status from Shevchenko to Symonenko as the symbol of the fate of Ukraine as family without father, nation without state.

The *surzhyk*-borne stories of Zholdak embody the postcolonial recognition that the grand anticolonial myths, symbols, and values are no longer productive and that continued exaggerated respect for them would constitute a narrowing of the cultural potentiality of the Ukrainian. It is the same insight that has inspired *PostPostup's* campaign to extend the use of Ukrainian expletives. The paper has published its own "Slovnychok-lainychok" ("Little Swearing Dictionary") and has made its own suggestions for new obscene expressions.[18]

Nowhere, perhaps, is the use of the erotic to desacralize a central anticolonial myth more wittily effected than in the poem "Liubit'!" ("Love!" 1992), Oleksandr Irvanets''s parody of Volodymyr Sosiura's patriotic poem "Liubit' Ukraïnu" (1944). The poet's call to love of motherland suffers something of a deconstruction as it echoes in Irvanets' invitation to engage in promiscuous amorous relations with the United States of America:

Любіть Оклахому! Вночі і в обід,
Як неньку і дедді достоту.
Любіть Індіану. Й так само любіть
Північну й Південну Дакоту.

Любіть Алабаму в загравах пожеж,
Любіть її в радощі й біди.
Айову любіть. Каліфорнію теж.
І пальми крислаті Флоріди [...].

Love Oklahoma! At night and at noon,
As you love your mummy and daddy.
Love Indiana. And don't love any less
North and South Dakota.

Love Alabama in the glow of wildfires,
Love her in joy and in anguish.
Love Iowa. California, too,
And the shaggy palm trees of Florida. [...][19]

It is not an exaggeration to assert that the erotic is an inalienable part of the strategy of the most visible (that is, in terms of public relations, most successful) branch of "young" literature in Ukraine today. There are those young writers who still cultivate the ideal of high seriousness (Ievhen Pashkovs'kyi, Viacheslav Medvid', Oleh Lysheha, most of the poets in the *Visimdesiatnyky* [*People of the 1980s*] collection,[20] the writers close to the new Kiev journal *Osnova*). For the moment, however, the limelight has been captured by the postmodern tricksters who, assuming colonialism to have died a natural death, have playfully challenged many of the myths that constitute the anticolonial tradition: the Great Poet and Literature in the service of the Nation, for example, or the mythical image of the Ukrainian Woman (as Kateryna the victim or Roksoliana the victim-heroine).

The best-known representatives of this trend are three poets who comprise the Bu-ba-bu group: Iurii Andrukhovych, Oleksandr Irvanets' and Viktor Neborak. ("Bu-ba-bu" stands for the first syllables of *burlesk* [burlesque], *balagan* [temporary structure for outdoor theatricals, circuses, etc.; mess, chaos], and *bufonada* [buffoonery].) Founded in 1985 and notorious since 1987, Bu-ba-bu has sought consistently to outrage a public postulated as traditionalist and still shockable, in large part by breaking the taboo on the explicit treatment of sex in public discourse. It is not by accident that, in Viktor Neborak's manifesto-like sound poem "Bubon" ("The Drum"), in which the syllables "bu" and "ba" are placed in various suggestive contexts, two lines that make grammatical sense are

Малюю бабу голуБУ [...]
Вам зуби вставить БУБАБУ.

I paint a blue broad [...]
BUBABU will put your teeth in for you.[21]

The lines summarize the ambition and the promise of the bubabists. The ambition is to create nontraditional art ("maliuiu babu holuBU" [I paint a blue broad] appears to allude to Picasso) while provoking through vulgarity and sexual content ("maliuiu babu holu" [I paint a naked broad]). The promise is no less than to empower the audience—to reverse the symptoms of its senility, to give it "bite" ("vam zuby vstavyt' BUBABU").

Bu-ba-bu celebrates the carnivalesque, and its members are candid about their awareness of Bakhtin, whom Andrukhovych all but quotes in his twelve-point definition of Bu-ba-bu for *Literaturna Ukraïna*:

Карнавал поєднує непоєднуване, жонглює ієрархічнимн цінностями, перекидає світ догори ногами, провокує найсвятіші ідеї, щоби порятувати їх від закостенілості й омертвіння. Карнавал—війна зі Смертю. Поки з нами карнавал—ми безсмертні. Бо ми взагалі не помремо.

Carnival unites the ununitable, it juggles hierarchical values, it turns the world on its head, it provokes the most sacred ideas in order to rescue them from ossification and death. Carnival is a war with death. While carnival is with us we are immortal. For we shall never die.[22]

Naturally, the Bu-ba-bists are more than aware of the sexually liberating dimension of carnival and more than subscribe to the Bakhtinian idea that the subversive potential of carnival manifests itself, in large part, in the sexual—that, under cover of the carnival mask, age, social status, sex, and personal identity are obscured and people are at liberty to enter into encounters, including erotic ones, that are usually prevented by social boundaries or gender conventions. In the process, prevailing hierarchies and power relations are, at least temporarily, disrupted.

These notions are perhaps most clearly embodied in Andrukhovych's short novel *Rekreatsiï* (*Recreations*, 1992), in which a cultural festival in the spirit of the "Chervona ruta" (Red Rue-Flower) song festival (Chernivtsi, 1989) is modelled as a carnival event. The festival reveals the ephemeral quality of the myth of the Great Poet (the participating Young Poets, lionized by public opinion, are represented as alcoholics, womanizers, vandals, and even poor versifiers), but it does not challenge the poets' vitality or attractiveness: that is evident in their sexual prowess. To make this point, Andrukhovych inserts into *Recreations* no fewer than two descriptions, from female points of view, of sex with Young Ukrainian Poets. The following is an excerpt from one of these:

Я схопила його обидвома руками, я сама ввела його, і тільки тоді він поступився і став виконувати моє благання, бо я вже ладна була думати, що він знущається, але все одно вірила, що ні, і тепер це вже була майже вершина, я боялася не встигнути до вершини, а він перестав собою володіти, от коли я його підкорила, він забув правила своєї гри, він уже не належав собі, а тільки мені, і тепер я намагалася стримати, ще трохи стримати, ще трохи стримати, я вже не чула власного голосу [...].

I seized him with both hands, I drew him in myself, and only then did he give way and start doing what I begged for, for I was ready to think that he was being cruel, but I also believed that he was not, and now this was almost the peak, I was afraid of not making it to the peak, he had lost control over himself, that is when I vanquished him, he had forgotten the rules of his game, he belonged no longer to himself but to me only, and now it was I who

was trying to restrain him, hold on a bit longer, hold on a bit longer, I couldn't hear my own voice any more [...].[23]

In addition to the obvious function of pleasing the biological reader, the passage also intends to outrage the reader accustomed to respecting literature as the repository of supreme national and moral values. It is clear that Andrukhovych regards such an anticolonial reader as part of the nemesis of Ukrainian culture. Andrukhovych's poem "Zahybel′ Kotliarevshchyny" ("The Death of *Kotliarevshchyna*," 1991), for example, directly asserts that it is not the proclamation of high ideals, but the cultural gesture represented by the *vertep*—the carnivalized Ukrainian Christmas puppet theatre, with its mixture of piety and comedy, high and low style, seriousness and parody—that has the prospect of survival into the future:

> вертеп не зачиниться з нього показано дулю
> отчизні і жизні і смерті і ясній зорі.
>
> The *vertep* will not close down, and it thumbs its nose
> at fatherland and life and death and the bright star.[24]

The subversive quality of Andrukhovych's carnivalized eroticism becomes especially apparent in the contrast between Andrukhovych and another accomplished prose writer, Iurii Pokal′chuk. Pokal′chuk, an experienced traveler in Latin America as well as a translator and scholarly critic of Latin American literature, is well aware of the potential of carnival to challenge received meanings and values. Yet, in his short story "Vagner" ("Wagner," 1990), set against the background of street life in Rio de Janeiro, the erotic serves to intensify a traditional, essentially romantic, image of love as the supreme human ideal.[25]

Insofar as the ideal location of Bakhtinian carnival is the market square, a feature characteristic of archaic cities, it is scarcely surprising that the Bu-ba-bists and their sympathizers confess to a strong affinity with the city of L′viv. L′viv, with its Ukrainian, Polish, Austro-Hungarian, Jewish and Armenian history, alludes to a cultural syncretism that lovers of carnival appreciate. Its historical underworld, its special argot and its ladies of the night go together to produce an atmosphere of excitement, expectation, and eros that have led Viktor Neborak, for example, in his poem "Mis′kyi boh Eros" ("The Urban God Eros," 1990), to speak of the structure of the city as

> жіноче тіло спопочіле і палке, пахке сп'яніле
> тіло міста,
>
> a female body, dusky and passionate, the fragrant intoxicated
> body of the city,[26]

and to imagine an analogy between the convoluted street plan and the internal female anatomy.

L′viv is also the main theater of activity of possibly the most single-minded, outrageous, and dedicated writer of Ukrainian erotic prose, Iurii Vynnychuk. Vynnychuk is the author of *Divy nochi* (*Ladies of the Night*, 1992), a short novel concerning an intellectual who becomes a pimp and reaps from this activity far greater pleasure and profit than from his previous way of life. Under Vynnychuk's editorship, the culture pages of the L′viv newspaper *PostPostup* became the vehicle for a sustained campaign to legitimate the erotic and render it familiar. Vynnychuk's own contributions included "Zhytiie haremnoie prez Nastasiiu Lisovsku z Rohatyna, zhe iu Roksolianoiu prozvano, pravdyvo spysanoie v roku 1548" ("Life in the Harem, Faithfully Recorded in 1548 by Nastasia Lisovs′ka of Rohatyn, Called Roksoliana")[27]—a parodic reworking of the Roksoliana plot as an anatomically frank account, in archaic language, of the defloration and further instruction of an inexperienced newcomer to the sultan's sexual service.

L′viv is a location from which the power disbalances produced by colonial situations are especially evident because of L′viv's own uneasy role as a culturally vibrant and historically significant city, which, however, is not the capital of the country and exists in a state of unresolved tension with Kiev. The situation is replicated in the recently-emerged tension between L′viv and the even less metropolitan west Ukrainian city of Ivano-Frankivs′k, where a veritable explosion of exciting cultural activity has recently taken place.[28] This is focussed on two new journals, *Pereval* and *Chetver*, in both of which the erotic asserts a strong presence. *Chetver* has been described, not inaccurately, as a cocktail of "classical exegesis, nonclassical German philosophy and vulgar Freudianism."[29]

Of particular interest is the third issue of *Chetver*, edited by Iurii Izdryk, which is structured like an encyclopedia: alphabetically ordered entries include biographies of the new gods of the subversive pantheon, comprising the Bu-ba-bists and their friends; theological, demonological, philosophical, and cabbalistic notes; poems and short stories; and other, seemingly random, items. The role of the erotic in the journal is not as prominent as Izdryk suggested when, introducing *Chetver* to the readers of *PostPostup*, he asserted that "*Chetver* is like the arrival of a mobile bordello in a provincial town."[30] Yet the third issue of the journal does illustrate in especially acute form a feature of the contemporary erotic writing which has been more or less evident in most of the material to which we have so far drawn attention: its aggressive machismo and male-centredness. In *Chetver* this feature is, admittedly, presented with a hint of irony—but it is the irony of hyperbole. The entry "Phallus," for example, concludes, without so much as a by-your-leave to Lacan or feminist theory, as follows:

> [Фалос—] це вежа найвищої дзвіниці чоловічого тіла, важіль світобудови і вісь обертання, магічне дерево життя і смерті, стовп добра і зла, ключ до найглибших копалень з діамантами, магічний шланг, тюльпанний спис, незгасаючий смолоскип, незламний корінь. Це—вектор, це—промінь. Амінь.

> [The Phallus] is the tower of the highest belfry of the male body, lever of the universe and axis of its revolution, wonder-tree of life and death, pillar of good and evil, key to the deepest diamond mines, magic hose, lance of tulips, undying torch, unbreakable root. It is the Vector, it is the Ray. Amen.[31]

The article "zhinka" (woman), on the other hand, reads,

> Жінка—це дивна білкова структура довкола отвору. Метафізична сутність жінки—отвір. Або, скажімо так,—поріг.

> Woman. A strange protein structure surrounding an orifice. The metaphysical essence of woman is the orifice. Or, let us say, the threshold.[32]

One could quote endless similar examples of formulations of male heterosexual triumphalism. Counterexamples illustrating any form of resistance to this phallic frenzy, on the other hand, are extremely difficult to find, even in writing by women. Many texts by women writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who today form part of the literary canon, Ol'ha Kobylians'ka and, as Roman Weretelnyk has shown, Lesia Ukraïnka, today sustain interpretation as challenges to the patriarchal order prevailing in the literary imagination of their day.[33] Writing by women authors in the 1980s and early 1990s, on the other hand, often affirms traditional romantic images of the female role: in the erotic encounter women are passive and receptive; women are endowed with attributes of beauty for the appreciation of their male lovers; women are fully realized only in love and in motherhood. The following poem by Liubov Holota is characteristic of this tendency:

> Я жінка. Я травина. Я роса.
> Я без кохання—мов калина на морозі. [...]
> Це задля тебе в мене руки білі,
> І голос плине тихою водою,
> І материнством квітне моє тіло.
> Я жінка. [...]
> Тебе чекаючи,
> була віки одна,
> І хочу народити тобі сина.
> Я жінка.

> I am a woman. I am a blade of grass. I am dew.
> Without love I am like a guelder rose in the frost. [...]
> It is for your sake that my hands are white
> And my voice runs like still waters
> And my body blossoms with motherhood.
> I am a woman. [...]
> Waiting for you

For ages I was alone.
I want to bear your son.
I am a woman.[34]

One encounters contemporary women writers of the younger generation who celebrate male dominance in sexual relations. Antonina Tsvyd, for example, in "Obertal'nyi khrest abo filosofiia dvokh" ("The Revolving Cross, or a Philosophy of the Two," 1992), a poem intended, as its subtitile specifies, "for the female voice," writes,

Ти—мій скульптор,
Я—камінь.
Руками
без різця і сокири
висікаєш із мене
жінку...

You are my sculptor,
I am a stone.
With your hands,
Without chisel or axe
you carve a woman
out of me...[35]

and, later,

Ти—голова усесвіту.
Я—лоно.
Ти—дух його,
А я—безсмертна плоть.

You are the head of the universe,
I am its womb.
You are its spirit,
And I am its immortal flesh.[36]

There is no hint that the hierarchy implied in Tsvyd's spirit/body, head/womb dichotomy is about to be questioned here.

A rare exception is Mstyslava Chaika, whose erotic poetry assumes the autonomy of female erotic sensation, celebrates female initiative in the sexual encounter, and is ironic at the expense of male self-stereotypes:

[...] мої несиметричні
як у справжньої амазонки
груди
стали пружнішими

і позадирали носики
як тоді коли ти стоїш поруч
[...]
Ну чому ти така гарна
просто зухвало гарна
немов після ночі кохання

Любий
тобі залишається
тільки позаздрити
собі у моєму сні.

[...] my asymmetrical breasts
like those of a real Amazon
have become firmer
and have turned up their noses
as when you stand alongside.
[...]
Well, why are you so beautiful—
so contemptuously beautiful
As after a night of love

My beloved,
all that remains to you
is to envy yourself
as you appear in my dream.[37]

But Chaika is the exception that highlights the rule. How to explain the paradoxical situation where the proclaimed intention of destabilizing received cultural and social hierarchies, in large part through mobilizing the subversive potential of eros, is accompanied by the vigorous assertion of traditional male dominance—precisely in the domain of erotic relations? A number of possibly relevant factors come to mind. Perhaps the sexual privilege of powerful men in Soviet and post-Soviet society—including the men in the cultural elite, bohemian or otherwise—is so attractive that it is celebrated by those who have it as much as by those who do not. Perhaps increasing awareness, but profound suspicion, of Western feminism encourages male writers to indulge in hyperbolic phallocentrism, occasionally tempered by a hint of irony. Perhaps the phenomenon in question is merely the anticolonial negation of the "absent father" myth inherited from Shevchenko's "Kateryna" and the *pokrytka* (shamed and abandoned unmarried mother) tradition.

If one were to attempt, at the end of this discussion, a generalization about the erotics of postcolonialism in Ukrainian literature today, it would be this: while there is a great deal of the erotic in Ukrainian postcolonialism, contemporary Ukrainian erotics is not itself very postcolonial.

If the condition of postcoloniality involves a transcendence, not only of the structures of colonial domination, but also of the anticolonial responses that mimic and replicate them, then, indeed, Ukrainian literature and culture today includes important and vibrant phenomena that can be called postcolonial. Much of the most interesting younger Ukrainian literature, and the aura of performance art and popular culture that surrounds it, is involved in the playful, parodic, in a word—postmodern demystification of both imperial and national values. This literature reveals and challenges the structures of political, social, and cultural power that prevailed in the Soviet period and enjoy an afterlife in post-Soviet times. The erotic, its novelty and therefore its ability both to shock and to fascinate still relatively intact, is certainly a central mechanism in this general strategy.

The field of the erotic itself, however, is no less polarized by power relations than are other spheres of post-Soviet experience, and there is very little evidence as yet of a general uprising against the hegemony of the heterosexual male point of view in the literary sphere. It may be that a softer, more conciliatory, indeed, more postcolonial resolution is just around the corner. But if that is the case, then this spring is not being heralded by a great many swallows just yet.

Monash University

NOTES

1. Viktoriia Stakh and Mstyslava Chaika, eds., *Bila knyha kohkannia. Antolohiia ukraïns'koï erotychnoï poeziï XX stolittia. Anons* ([Kiev]: Biblioteka zhurnalu "Chas," n.d. [c. 1991]).

2. This view is maintained, for example, by Hryhorii Klochek in his essay, "Chortytsia. Erotyzm u suchasnii prozi i shcho za nym vbachaiet'sia," *Literaturna Ukraïna*, 1 July 1993, 4.

3. Mikhail Shtern and August Stern, *Sex in the USSR* (New York: Times Books, 1980). See also "Zur sexuellen Frage in der UdSSR. Interview mit Professor Dr. Igor S. Kon (Moskau)," in Joachim S. Hohmann, ed., *Sexualforschung und Politik in der Sowjetunion seit 1917* (Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 1990), 297–306.

4. Brian Edwards, "Textual Erotics: The Meta-Perspective and Reading Instruction in Robert Kroetsch's Later Fiction," *Australian-Canadian Studies* 5 (1987), no. 2: 69–80.

5. "Post-Colonial Features in Contemporary Ukrainian Culture," *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* 6 (1992), no. 2: 41–55, here 45.

6. This fact has been noted even on the pages of one of Kiev's most widely read general-interest dailies. See Kostiantyn Rodyk, "'Zhinky—tse okrema natsiia.' Chy vzhe maiemo novu ukraïns'ku erotychnu literaturu?" *Vechirnii Kyïv*, 30 October 1993. The question in the subtitle ("Do we have a new Ukrainian erotic literature?") the correspondent answers in the affirmative.

7. Klochek, 4.

8. Pavlo Zahrebel'nyi, *Hola dusha. Povist' (Spovid' pered dyktofonom)* (Kiev: Presa Ukraïny, 1992), 39. This and all subsequent translations are mine.

9. Ievhen Hutsalo, *Blud. Ukraïna: rozpusta i vyrodzhennia* (Kiev: Ukraïns'kyi pys'mennyk, 1993), 2.

10. See my article, "Yevhen Hutsalo's *Pozychenyi cholovik*: The Whimsical in the Contemporary Soviet Ukrainian Novel," in *In Working Order: Essays Presented to G. S. N. Luckyj*, ed. E. N. Burstynsky and R. Lindheim (Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1990), 113–28.

11. Anna Berehulak, "Positions of Coloniality in the Ukrainian Historical Novel," Ph.D. thesis in progress at Monash University.

12. I have developed this argument fully in the article, "Mythological, Religious and Philosophical Topoi in the Prose of Valerii Shevchuk," *Slavic Review* 50 (1991): 905–13.

13. Roman Kukharuk, "Shevchuka potiahnulo na seks," *PostPostup*, 1992, no. 33 (47), 10.

14. Valerii Shevchuk, "Misiatseva zozul'ka iz lastiv'iachoho hnizda," *Suchasnist'* no. 3 (March 1992): 15–53, here 15.

15. Ibid., 21.

16. Valerii Shevchuk, "Kartyna bez ramky na holii stini," *Berezil'*, 1991 (6): 13–94, here 65.

17. *PostPostup*, 1992, no. 39 (53), 29.

18. *PostPostup*, 1992, no. 38 (52), 19 and 1993, no. 4 (67), 23.

19. *Pereval*, 1993 (1): 153–54.

20. Ihor Rymaruk, ed. *Visimdesiatnyky: Antolohiia novoï ukraïns'koï poeziï* (Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1990).

21. Viktor Neborak, "Bubon," in his collection *Litaiucha holova* (Kiev: Molod', 1990), 36.

22. "'Bu-ba-bu' i vse inshe," *Literaturna Ukraïna*, 28 March 1991, 7.

23. Iurii Andrukhovych, "Rekreatsiï," *Suchasnist'* no. 1 (January 1992): 27–85, here 79.

24. Iurii Andrukhovych, "Zahybel' Kotliarevshchyny, abo zh bezkonechna podorozh u bezsmertia," in his collection *Ekzotychni ptakhy i roslyny* (Kiev: Molod', 1991), 63–64, here 64. "Otchyzni i zhyzni i smerti" alludes to an uncharacteristically solemn passage in Part 5 of Kotliarevs'kyi's *Eneïda*: "Liubov k otchyzni de heroit', / Tam syla vrazha ne ustoit', / Tam hrud' syl'nisha od harmat, / Tam zhyzn'—altyn, a smert'—kopiika" ("Where love for fatherland heroically is felt, / There the enemy's force will not prevail, / There the [warrior's] breast is stronger than cannon, / There life is worth a penny, and death—a farthing"). See I. P. Kotliarevs'kyi, *Tvory* (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oï literatury, 1957), 186. "Iasna zoria" is part of the standard locution "na iasni zori, na tykhi vody," familiar from Ukrainian *dumy* and thus associated with the heroic representation of the Cossack past.

25. Iurii Pokal'chuk, "Vagner," *Svito-vyd* 1 (1990), no. 1: 24–35.

26. Neborak, *Litaiucha holova*, 39.

27. *PostPostup*, 1992, no. 1 (15), 15 and no. 12 (26), 10.

28. A typically strident account of this tension is contained in Ksenia Nesterenko's article, "Pro pana Bazia, pruten' i kuliu zamist' holovy," *PostPostup*, 1993, no. 28, 13. The essay begins with a provocative claim: "Slowly but inevitably L'viv is becoming provincial." No cultural phenomenon in L'viv, asserts the author, can match the importance of the emergence of *Chetver* and *Pereval* in Ivano-Frankivs'k.

29. Liubko Petrenko, "L'vivs'ka prezentatsiia 'Chetverha'," *PostPostup*, 1993, no. 1 (64), 13.

30. Iurko Izdryk, "Cherhova buria u shkliantsi 'Stanislav' (Sproba hlybynnoho analizu provintsiinoï dumky)," *PostPostup*, 1992, no. 46 (60), 26.

31. *Chetver*, 1992, no. 1 (3): 119.

32. Ibid., 60.

33. Roman Vereteľnyk [Weretelnyk], "Feminizm u dramaturhiï Lesi Ukraïnky," *Suchasnist'* no. 2 (June 1991): 29–31 and "Kozachka v teremi," *Slovo i chas*, 1992 (6): 46–50.

34. Liubov Holota, untitled poem, in her collection *Dzerkala. Liryka* (Kiev: Dnipro, 1989), 5–6, here 5. Originally published in Holota's anthology *Narodzhennia v stepakh* (1976), the poem introduces the 1989 collection.

35. Antonina Tsvyd, "Obertal'nyi khrest, abo filosofiia dvokh. Poema-trylohiia dlia zhinochoho holosu," in her collection *Blahovist kriz' vid'mats'kyi rehit. Poema-trylohiia i virshi* (Kiev: Molod', 1992), 4–31, here 6. The poem was first published in *Avzhezh*, 1991, no. 5. An abridged version emphasizing the erotic sections of the work was published in the youth journal *Ranok*, 1992 (6): 18–21.

36. Tsvyd, *Blahovist kriz' vid'mats'kyi rehit*, 16.

37. Mstyslava Chaika, "Feminum ego," *Ranok*, 1991 (3): 6.

REVIEW ARTICLES

The Monumental Construction of Chernihiv's Princes in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*

VOLODYMYR I. MEZENTSEV

THE DYNASTY OF CHERNIGOV, 1054–1146. By *Martin Dimnik*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1994. xxiv, 485 pp. ISBN 0-88844-116-9. $98.50.

This monograph deals with the princely dynasty of medieval Chernihiv. Between the ninth and thirteenth centuries, this city ranked third in terms of significance in Rus' after Kiev and Novgorod. Chernihiv thus successfully vied with Kiev and Halych for political supremacy in southern Rus' during the pre-Mongol period.[1] The Chernihiv lands occupied a vast territory from the Middle Dnieper in the west to the Don and Oka Rivers in the east, including the principality of Tmutarakan' in the northeastern Black Sea region in the eleventh century (Maps 3–5).

For the past decade, Chernihiv and many towns on its lands have been the focus of major archaeological research, which has yielded important discoveries.[2] Ukrainian, Russian, and Western scholars have also become increasingly interested in Chernihiv's origin and urban development, famous architectural monuments, political and ecclesiastical history, and the historical geography of its lands.[3]

The monograph under review, dedicated to the history of Chernihiv's princely house, is most welcome. Such a comprehensive study has great value, because of the importance of both Chernihiv itself and its ruling family in the history and culture of Kievan Rus'. The broad range of problems illuminated in this book elevates its significance far beyond that of a mere regional study.

The Canadian historian Martin Dimnik has already written a series of excellent works on the princely elites of Chernihiv from the eleventh to the mid–thirteenth century.[4] His new monograph concentrates on the Sviatoslavichi dynasty of Chernihiv between 1054, when its progenitor, Sviatoslav, the son of Iaroslav the Wise, began his rule and 1146, when Vsevolod Ol'govich, Sviatoslav's grandson, died.[5] The author traces in detail the genealogy, dynastic ties, biographies, and reigns of three generations of this ruling house.

* Research for this review article was made possible in part by a research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, which I gratefully acknowledge. I also wish to express my thanks to Ms. Patricia Patchet-Golubev of the University of Toronto for her editorial assistance and kind recommendations in preparing this work for publication. Ms. Caroline Suma of the St. Michael Library, Toronto, also provided generous advice.

In particular, he reexamines the princely succession system for the thrones of Kiev, Chernihiv, and the other main cities of Rus', which was introduced by Iaroslav the Wise (pp. 18–34). Dimnik also presents a new interpretation of the agreement among Rus' princes at the Liubech council of 1097, where this system of succession and the patrimonial rights of princes was modified (pp. 208–23). At this council, the Chernihiv lands were decreed to be the permanent patrimony of the Sviatoslavichi and their descendants. The author's findings help us to understand more clearly the reasons behind the growing interprincely strife and fragmentation of Rus'.

Contrary to the generally accepted view, Dimnik maintains that Sviatoslav's son Oleg (d. 1115), to whom he devotes a great deal of attention, was genealogically senior to his brother David (d. 1123). He bases this observation on an analysis of the frontispiece miniature from Sviatoslav's *"Izbornik* of 1073," which depicts the members of the prince's family with their names inscribed in the correct order of genealogical seniority (pp. 38–39). This conclusion leads the author to a significant reinterpretation of the Sviatoslavichi's dynastic history, their territorial allocations and relationships to one another. For example, according to the author, Oleg was not only a Prince of Novhorod-Sivers'kyi, but also a co-ruler of Chernihiv with David between 1097 and 1115 (pp. 213–14).

Dimnik examines the political rivalry between the Sviatoslavichi and other powerful ruling families such as the Iziaslavichi, Vsevolodovichi, Monomashichi and Mstislavichi, and determines the extent of their landholdings (Map 5). He also sheds new and interesting light on military conflicts, diplomatic and cultural relations, and marital alliances between the princes of Chernihiv and other rulers of Rus', Poland, Germany, Byzantium, as well as the nomadic Cumans or Polovtsians. Furthermore, the author discusses the Sviatoslavichi's patronage of Church and culture—their construction of churches and monasteries and sponsorship of missionary activity on their lands. The Rus' Orthodox Church even canonized several princes of Chernihiv as martyrs and saints in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

In addition, Dimnik describes the historical topography of early Chernihiv and its princely monumental architecture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Finally, he provides new and valuable evidence on heretofore little-studied Tmutarakan', Novhorod-Sivers'kyi, Murom, and other towns on the Chernihivan lands, as well as on Kiev, Novgorod the Great, Smolensk, Turaŭ (Turov), and other capitals of Rus' principalities where the Sviatoslavichi reigned. The author himself visited many of these sites and consulted with local researchers.

The work is based on an analysis of many primary sources, including chronicles, narrative accounts, poems of Rus', the *Paterikon* of the Kiev Caves Monastery, graffiti of St. Sophia Cathedral in Kiev, and popular legends of Chernihiv. Dimnik has also used archeological, architectural, artistic, sphragistic, and numismatic evidence. He has even drawn material from Chernihivan publications dating from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which are rare in the West.

In the light of recent research, several issues raised in the monograph, regarding the historical topography of early Chernihiv and the monumental building of its princes during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, merit closer attention. These include princely patronage of church construction, the origins of their master builders and fresco artists, and the Byzantine, Balkan Slavic, and Central European Romanesque influences on this city's architecture and its mural paintings.

In his introduction, Dimnik describes Chernihiv's urban territory, particularly its aristocratic citadel or *detinets* of the tenth to twelfth centuries (pp. 11–12, 16). Ongoing archaeological discoveries nevertheless continue to supplement and modify our knowledge of this urban development. For instance, according to the most recent excavation data, which have come out after the book's publication, a smaller late ninth- or early tenth-century princely fortress or castle preceded this citadel. In 1991, remnants of its fortifications were uncovered in the southern promontory of the so-called *Val* (Bank).[6]

Later on, the author argues convincingly that construction on the Cathedral of the Transfiguration of the Holy Savior was temporarily halted after the death of its founder, Prince Mstislav Volodimerovich, in 1034, during the reign of Iaroslav the Wise in Chernihiv (1034–1054). Iaroslav's son Sviatoslav, who inherited the throne of Chernihiv and ruled there between 1054 and 1073, completed the building of the cathedral (pp. 101–104, 128). Indeed, Iaroslav himself had begun a grandiose construction campaign in Kiev ca. 1037 and later in Novgorod and Polatsk (Polotsk), apparently transferring the necessary masters to these cities from Chernihiv,[7] and hence neglecting to finish the Holy Savior Cathedral.

Dimnik further believes that a member of Sviatoslav's family, perhaps Oleg Sviatoslavich, likely erected the small, two-story masonry church with a mausoleum in its lower floor, the remnants of which were excavated in Chernihiv's citadel in 1986. He thus disagrees with the researchers of this monument who assert that Prince Volodimer Monomakh commissioned its construction in 1078–1081.[8] According to Dimnik, it is unlikely that Monomakh would build a church in the Sviatoslavichi's domain, since he recognized Chernihiv as their patrimony. Also, if this church was a mausoleum, Monomakh had no reason to construct one in Chernihiv, because there was little likelihood he would be buried there (p. 261, fn. 301).

The view of the researchers of this two-story church seems, however, more conclusive. For Oleg was not buried in this church, but rather in the Holy Savior Cathedral,[9] which his father Sviatoslav had completed. Meanwhile, his brother David was interred in the SS. Gleb and Boris Cathedral (1115–1123) in Chernihiv, which he himself had built.[10] Neither was Monomakh laid to rest in this two-story church in Chernihiv. Rather, as is known, he surrendered the Chernihivan throne to Oleg in 1094 and later became Prince of Kiev, where he was buried.[11] Monomakh, however, probably did construct a patrimonial church or mausoleum in Chernihiv during his reign there, after his victory over Oleg and his allies in 1078. At that time, as the author demonstrates, Monomakh and his father,

Vsevolod Iaroslavich, seized Chernihiv from the Sviatoslavichi, evidently intending to appropriate it as the private possession of their family (pp. 141, 150).

Nevertheless, even as Prince of Chernihiv, Monomakh could not have been buried in the city's Holy Savior Cathedral, which was the patrimonial mausoleum of the Sviatoslavichi. He could, though, have built his own patrimonial church or mausoleum in the prestigious aristocratic citadel of Chernihiv for his and his family's burial. The modest size of this two-story church, compared to the large cathedrals that Sviatoslav and David commissioned in Chernihiv, possibly reflects Monomakh's insecure position in that city, a status noted by Dimnik (p. 187).

Moreover, as the researchers of this structure have clearly shown, this late eleventh-century two-story church belongs to the Constantinopolitan architectural school, whereas all of Oleg's and David's known masonry edifices in early twelfth-century Chernihiv represent a later architectural style of Rus',[12] the origins of which will be discussed below. The remnants of the princely palace or church that were excavated under the SS. Gleb and Boris Cathedral have also been connected to Monomakh's construction in Chernihiv. Judging from the building technique, the same Constantinopolitan masters erected both this edifice and the two-story church.[13] A detailed description of Monomakh's building activity in Chernihiv is, of course, beyond the scope of Dimnik's monograph, for the author has chosen to concentrate specifically on the Sviatoslavichi dynasty.

In Dimnik's opinion, at the turn of the twelfth century Oleg introduced to Chernihiv a new style of architecture and building technique which synthesized Byzantine and Romanesque features.[14] The prince evidently borrowed this architecture from the Greek island of Rhodes, where he had lived in exile between 1079 and 1083. According to the author, Oleg also commissioned the first structure in this style—the Assumption Cathedral in Chernihiv's Ielets'kyi Monastery—sometime between 1094 and 1115 (pp. 261–64, 309).

No consensus exists, however, regarding the patronage or the dating of these new style edifices in Chernihiv to within the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.[15] For the only structure mentioned in the written sources is the SS. Gleb and Boris Cathedral: we learn there that David erected it before 1123.[16] There are also divergent hypotheses on the provenance of the builders of these masonry monuments in Chernihiv and Kiev.

Some scholars deny the participation of any invited Byzantine or Romanesque masters in twelfth-century Chernihivan or Kievan construction. They contend that local Rus' masters developed the architecture, decoration, and building techniques of this new style on the basis of both Byzantine traditions and Romanesque artistic influences from the West.[17] Since it is now widely accepted, however, that the migration of master builders and architects served as the main catalyst in spreading novel architectural and technical influences in Rus',[18] this view is unsubstantiated. The significant differences between these new style Chernihiv structures and the

earlier masonry edifices of the Constantinopolitan school also suggest that foreign masters were involved in creating this style.

Pavel A. Rappoport maintains, similarly to Dimnik, that Oleg invited builders to Chernihiv from a certain Byzantine province where the architecture bore Romanesque influences. The identity of this architectural center, however, has yet to be determined.[19] Indeed, some Romanesque decorative elements on the façades of these Chernihiv churches, especially the corbel-table friezes, were atypical of the architecture of Byzantium.[20] Hence, it seems more likely that masters were imported from the West and possibly collaborated in Chernihiv with either Byzantine builders[21] or local masons, who continued Byzantine traditions of building techniques and materials into the twelfth century. Also, the carved whitestone decorative details from these Chernihiv edifices closely resemble Romanesque sculpture of the West.[22]

The importation of builders from one land to another was most frequently connected with political or dynastic alliances between rulers, but also occasionally with the transfer of princes from one city to another in Rus'.[23] Therefore, the political and marital ties between Sviatoslav (and his heirs) and the rulers of Poland and Germany, a subject examined in detail in Dimnik's monograph (pp. 37, 41, 99, 253, 383, n. 138), may indicate the specific country or center from which the Romanesque style was imported to Chernihiv. Polish architects and masons from the early twelfth century, along with Hungarian and German specialists from the mid-twelfth century, brought Romanesque influences to the stone architecture of Galicia and the principality of Vladimir-Suzdal'.[24] Similarly, Romanesque masters may have come from these countries to Chernihiv even earlier—at the turn of the twelfth century—thus giving Chernihiv the lead over the other cities of Rus' in the development of this new style of architecture and construction technique.

Rappoport has also suggested that when Prince Vsevolod, the son of Oleg, left Chernihiv to assume the Kievan throne in 1139, he brought with him Chernihivan masters of this new style. In the 1140s, they built St. Cyril's Church which, according to this view, was the first structure in this style in Kiev. In the mid-twelfth century this fashionable architectural style, having prevailed in the capital of Rus', spread to many other towns, such as Kaniv, Pereiaslavl', Volodymyr-Volyns'kyi, Smolensk, and Old Riazan'.[25]

Dimnik correctly observes, however, that even before 1139, Vsevolod dispatched Chernihivan architects to assist the Kievan prince Mstislav Volodimerovich in constructing the Mother of God *Pyrohoshcha* Church in Kiev, between 1131 and 1136.[26] This edifice imitated Chernihivan churches of the new style (p. 389, n. 155). Furthermore, recent research has revealed that the earliest known Kievan structure with features of this style was St. Theodore's Church, founded by Mstislav in his patrimonial monastery of the same name in 1129–1133.[27] Apparently, Chernihivan architects began importing a new style to Kiev from this time. Nevertheless, in erecting St. Theodore's and the *Pyrohoshcha* Churches, they

evidently employed local Kievan masons.[28] In all likelihood, Vsevolod sent his more advanced architects to Kiev, in order to thank Mstislav for having approved his usurpation of the Chernihivan throne in 1127 and for cooperating with him. In his monograph, the author closely scrutinizes the personal and political bonds between these two princes (pp. 314–23).

Vsevolod seems to have transferred the entire Chernihivan building artel, including the masons, with him to Kiev in 1139. Thus St. Cyril's Church in Kiev, which they constructed, not only resembles Chernihiv's SS. Gleb and Boris Cathedral, but is virtually identical in its building technique and embellishment. Vsevolod soon moved the old Kievan artel of builders of the Constantinopolitan tradition to the provincial city of Polatsk.[29] This transfer was also the result of a political agreement between Vsevolod and the ruling family of Polatsk, which was reinforced by the marriage alliance of 1143, described by Dimnik (p. 356, n. 80 and p. 384).

Therefore, Chernihiv's architectural school, which had been founded by the Sviatoslavichi at the turn of the twelfth century, had spread widely over Rus', including its capital city of Kiev, by the mid-twelfth century. Besides the great artistic and technical achievements of Chernihivan architecture, Vsevolod Ol'govich's expansionist and ambitious policies may also have stimulated this broad diffusion. This prince's attempts to assert his control over the vast lands of Rus', his energetic patronage of Church and culture, and his zeal for building, all of which Dimnik investigates in some detail (pp. 314–415), serve to explain the rise and wide dissemination of Chernihiv's architecture.

With Vsevolod's death in 1146 there began a period of extended internecine strife among the princely dynasties of Chernihiv, Suzdal', Smolensk, Volhynia and Halych, as each sought to control the Kievan throne.[30] This led to a decline in monumental construction in Chernihiv and Kiev until its renewal in the 1170s and 1180s under the rule of Sviatoslav, the son of Vsevolod, in these cities. The Chernihivan princes' reigns of this period, however, form the subject of the author's next book.

In this monograph Dimnik addresses as well the origin of the artists who painted the famous frescoes in St. Cyril's Church in Kiev. He concludes that they were probably Slavs, because of the Cyrillic inscriptions on the frescoes. Also, the depictions of Macedonian and Bulgarian saints in the apses of the church testify vividly to the close cultural links between Rus' and the South Slavs (pp. 392–93). Likewise, art historians see analogies in these frescoes to mural paintings of medieval Bulgaria, Macedonia or Serbia, as well as some influences from Romanesque art.[31] Also noted is the resemblance between the frescoes of the Kievan St. Cyril's and the surviving fragments of frescoes from the Ielets'kyi Monastery's Assumption Cathedral in Chernihiv.[32] The latter frescoes similarly reveal influences from eleventh-century Macedonian church paintings.[33] Nevertheless, researchers have not identified the artists who painted these two churches.

They may have been either South Slavs or local fresco artists from Rus′ who had been influenced by Balkan painting. Bulgaria and Macedonia from the tenth century, and Serbia from the twelfth century, all exerted a significant impact on the art and entire culture of Rus′.[34] Dimnik, for example, presents interesting evidence of Prince Sviatoslav Iaroslavich's veneration of St. Simeon, the Tsar of Bulgaria (893–927), and his corresponding emulation of manuscripts commissioned by the latter (the *izborniki*) and of the tsar's cultural activity in general (pp. 114–19).

Nevertheless, the possible Balkan provenance or orientation of the fresco artists of Kiev's St. Cyril's Church and Chernihiv's Assumption Cathedral does not indicate an identical origin of the new-style masters who constructed them.[35] For in Rus′ and Byzantium, the artists who decorated structures with frescoes or mosaics formed their own organizations, distinct from the architects' and masons' artels, which included sculptors or stone carvers as well.[36] The origins and cultural orientations of these separate artists' and builders' organizations could therefore have been different. Moreover, artists frequently painted church frescoes or mosaics considerably later than the construction process. Thus, specialists assert that Kiev's St. Cyril's Church, erected in the 1140s, was not embellished with frescoes until the 1170s.[37] Similarly, some art historians contend that Chernihiv's Assumption Cathedral was decorated with frescoes in the second half of the twelfth century,[38] although many researchers, including Dimnik, believe it was the first new-style structure to be built in Rus′ in the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries[39] (p. 264). All of this indicates that the fresco artists of these churches were evidently not members of the construction artels, and therefore may well have had other geographic origins.

Building artels in Chernihiv and Old Riazan′ did, however, include sculptors or carvers who fashioned whitestone architectural details to ornament the exteriors of the new style edifices there. As already mentioned, these carved stone details, as well as the architecture, decoration, and some of the construction methods of these structures, have close analogies in the Romanesque art of the West.

Furthermore, in all likelihood the masters of this new style could not have come to Chernihiv from the South Slavic countries at the turn of the twelfth century, since mature Romanesque architecture with exterior sculptural decoration spread to Croatia or Dalmatia from Italy only from the beginning of the twelfth century.[40] From there, it penetrated to Serbia even later—at the end of the twelfth century.[41] Meanwhile, in medieval Macedonia and Bulgaria, Byzantine architecture dominated entirely and Romanesque architectural forms, sculpture, and building techniques were not developed, particularly in the eleventh or twelfth century.[42]

Only Slovenia borrowed mature Romanesque architecture and construction techniques from Lombardy in the tenth or eleventh century,[43] that is, earlier than Chernihiv. No evidence exists, however, of any political or dynastic ties between the princes of Rus′, particularly those of eleventh- and twelfth-century Chernihiv, and the rulers of distant Slovenia. Similarly absent are any written or other valid

sources on the importation to Rus′ of master builders or architects from the South Slavic countries. Instead, the evidence suggests the participation of Byzantine and Romanesque masters from Poland, Hungary, and Germany.[44] Hence, this assumed involvement of builders from Central Europe in Chernihiv's new style construction does not contradict the author's assertion regarding the Slavic origin and Balkan orientation of the artists who decorated some of these churches with frescoes.

In his study, Dimnik thus explores many of the intriguing issues that have been provoking lively debate in recent scholarship on Kievan Rus′. His monograph will undoubtedly stimulate further research and discussion.

The book is also well illustrated, containing twenty-five of the author's own valuable photographs. He has provided us with views of medieval sites in Chernihiv, Kiev, Novhorod-Sivers′kyi, their magnificent eleventh- and twelfth-century churches and monasteries, the frescoes of Kiev's St. Cyril's Church, as well as chronicle miniatures, icons, seals, and coins that have been attributed to the princes of Chernihiv and Tmutarakan′ (Figs. 1–25). Unfortunately, some of the fresco photographs are of poor quality. Also included are interesting reconstructive plans of eleventh- and twelfth-century Chernihiv and Kiev, as well as maps of Rus′, the principality of Tmutarakan′, and the lands of Chernihiv in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which were prepared on the basis of recent findings (Maps 1–5). Finally, five genealogical tables are appended, displaying the first princes of Rus′ between the tenth and twelfth centuries and the dynasties of Halych, Turaŭ, Chernihiv and Pereiaslavl′ of the eleventh and twelfth centuries (Tables 1–5).

In summary, the monograph under review represents a major contribution to the hitherto scant literature on the history and culture of the Chernihiv principality, and to the historiography of Kievan Rus′ in general. It will be most valuable for students of the princely elites, political and ecclesiastical history, geography, archeology, architecture, and art of Rus′. We look forward to Dimnik's second book, the final part of this project, which will cover Chernihiv's princely dynasty between 1146 and 1246, as well as to published Ukrainian translations of both these works for the broad academic public in Ukraine.

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto

NOTES

1. Boris A. Rybakov, "Drevnosti Chernigova," *Materialy i issledovaniia po arkheologii SSSR* (Moscow and St. Petersburg [Leningrad]), 1949 (11): 7–10; Volodymyr I. Mezentsev, *Drevnii Chernigov. Genezis i istoricheskaia topografiia goroda,* Abstract of candidate (Ph.D.) dissertation (Kiev, 1981), 13–23; idem, "The Territorial and Demographic Development of Medieval Kiev and Other Major Cities of Rus′: A Comparative Analysis Based on Recent Archaeological Research," *The Russian Review* 48, no. 2 (1989): 161–69; Volodymyr P. Kovalenko, "Osnovnye etapy razvitiia drevnego Chernigova," *Chernigov i ego okruga v IX–XIII vv.* (Kiev, 1988), 26–32.

2. See, for example, P. P. Tolochko et al., eds., *Problemy arkheologii Iuzhnoi Rusi. Materialy istoriko-arkheologicheskogo seminara "Chernigov i ego okruga v IX–XIII vv." Chernigov, 26–28 sentiabria 1988 g.* (Kiev, 1990); P. P. Tolochko et al., eds., *Starozhytnosti Pivdennoï Rusi. Materialy III istoryko-arkheolohichnoho seminaru "Chernihiv i ioho okruha v IX–XIII st." Chernihiv, 15–18 travnia 1990 r.* (Chernihiv, 1993).

3. See, for instance, Aleksei K. Zaitsev, "Chernigovskoe kniazhestvo," *Drevnerusskie kniazhestva X–XIII vv.* (Moscow, 1975), 57–117; Volodymyr I. Mezentsev, "Do pytannia pro henezys davn'oho Chernihova," *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (Kiev), 1980 (1): 107–112; idem, "Pro formuvannia mis'koï terytoriï davn'oho Chernihova," *Arkheolohiia,* 1980 (34): 53–64; idem, "The Masonry Churches of Medieval Chernihiv," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 11, no. 3/4 (December 1987): 365–83; Volodymyr P. Kovalenko, "K istoricheskoi topografii Chernigovskogo detintsa," in *Problemy arkheologii Iuzhnoi Rusi,* 15–23; idem, "Arkhitektura Chernigovo-Severskoi zemli v epokhu 'Slova o polku Igoreve'," *Ex oriente lux: Mélanges* (Brussels) vol. 1 (1991), 201–14; V. P. Kovalenko and P. A. Rappoport, "Pamiatniki drevnerusskoi arkhitektury v Chernigovo-Severskoi zemle," *Zograf* (Belgrade) 18 (1987): 5–11; Jean Blankoff, "Černigov, rivale de Kiev? À propos de son développement urbain," *Revue des études slaves. Tirage à part* (Paris) 63, no. 1 (1991): 145–60; P. P. Tolochko et al., eds., *Chernihivs'ka starovyna. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats', prysviachenyi 1300-richchiu Chernihova* (Chernihiv, 1992); V. P. Kovalenko et al., eds., *1000 rokiv Chernihivs'kii ieparkhiï. Tezy dopovidei tserkovno-istorychnoï konferentsiï. Chernihiv, 22–24 veresnia 1992 r.* (Chernihiv, 1992).

4. Martin Dimnik, *Mikhail, Prince of Chernigov and Grand Prince of Kiev, 1224–1246* (Toronto, 1981); idem, "The Place of Ryurik Rostislavich's Death: Kiev or Chernigov?" *Mediaeval Studies* (Toronto) 44 (1982): 371–93; idem, "Oleg Svyatoslavich and his Patronage of the Cult of SS. Boris and Gleb," *Mediaeval Studies* 50 (1988): 349–70; idem, "Sviatoslav and the Eparchy of Chernigov (1054–1076)," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* (Edmonton) 34, no. 4 (1992): 373–90; idem, "Oleg's Status as Ruler of Tmutarakan': The Sphragistic Evidence," *Mediaeval Studies* 55 (1993): 137–49.

5. In Dimnik's next book, which is currently in progress, he examines the history of Chernihiv's ruling family between 1146 and 1246, i.e., during the century preceding the Mongol invasion of Rus'.

6. I. M. Ihnatenko and V. P. Kovalenko, "Novi doslidzhennia na Verkhn'omy zamku v Chernihovi," *Arkheolohichni doslidzhennia v Ukraïni 1991 roku* (Luts'k, 1993), 38–39.

7. Pavel A. Rappoport, *Zodchestvo Drevnei Rusi* (St. Petersburg [Leningrad], 1986), 22–23.

8. See V. P. Kovalenko and P. A. Rappoport, "Pamiatniki drevnerusskoi arkhitektury v Chernigovo-Severskoi zemle," 8, 9; idem, "Novyi pamiatnik vizantiiskogo zodchestva na Chernigovskom detintse," *Iuzhnaia Rus' i Vizantiia. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov (k XVIII kongressu vizantinistov)* (Kiev, 1991), 152–55.

9. *Povest' vremennykh let,* ed. V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, pt. 1 (Moscow and St. Petersburg [Leningrad], 1950), 200.

10. "Slovo o kniazekh," in O. I. Bilets'kyi, comp., *Khrestomatiia davn'oï ukraïns'koï literatury (do kintsia XVIII st.),* 3rd edition (Kiev, 1967), 52.

11. *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei,* vol. 2, *Ipat'evskaia letopis',* 2nd edition (St. Petersburg, 1908), col. 289.

12. See nn. 8 and 13.

13. V. P. Kovalenko and P. A. Rappoport, "Etapy razvitiia drevnerusskoi arkhitektury Chernigovo-Severskoi zemli," *Russia Mediaevalis* (Munich) 7, no. 1 (1992): 44–46, 49; see also n. 8.

14. For information on this architectural style in Rus' see, for example, Iu. S. Aseev, *Arkhitektura Kyïvs'koï Rusi* (Kiev, 1969), 115–47; Rappoport, *Zodchestvo Drevnei Rusi,* 48–62.

15. See, for instance, Volodymyr P. Kovalenko and Ruslan S. Orlov, "Riz'blenyi kamin' 1984 r. z Chernihivs'koho dytyntsia," *Chernihivs'ka starovyna* (Chernihiv, 1992), 26.

16. See n. 10.

17. E. V. Vorob"ëva and A. A. Tits, "O datirovke Uspenskogo i Borisoglebskogo soborov v Chernigove," *Sovetskaia arkheologiia* (hereafter *SA*)(Moscow), 1974 (2): 103–104, 109, 111; Iurii S. Aseev, "Stilisticheskie osobennosti chernigovskogo zodchestva XII–XIII vv.," *Chernigov i ego*

okruga v IX–XIII vv. (Kiev, 1988), 137–40; Petro P. Tolochko, "Kiev i Chernigov v IX–XIII vv.," ibid., 20.

18. Pavel A. Rappoport, "Vneshnie vliianiia i ikh rol' v istorii drevnerusskoi arkhitektury," *Vizantiia i Rus'* (Moscow, 1989), 140; idem, *Drevnerusskaia arkhitektura* (St. Petersburg, 1993), 26–27.

19. P. A. Rappoport, "Iz istorii kievo-chernigovskogo zodchestva XII v.," *Kratkie soobshcheniia Instituta arkheologii* (Moscow), 1984 (179): 62; idem, "O roli vizantiiskogo vliianiia v razvitii drevnerusskoi arkhitektury," *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 45 (1984): 189.

20. See, for example, Richard Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (Harmondsworth, U.K., 1975), 401; Cyril Mango, *Byzantine Architecture. History of World Architecture* (New York, 1985), 176–77, 179.

21. This was another possible version suggested by Rappoport in his "Iz istorii kievo-chernigovskogo zodchestva XII v.," 62. Cf. n. 19. See also Mezentsev, "The Masonry Churches of Medieval Chernihiv," 375.

22. Ruslan S. Orlov, "Belokamennaia rez'ba drevnerusskogo Chernigova," *Problemy arkheologii Iuzhnoi Rusi* (Kiev, 1990), 28–33; V. P. Kovalenko and R. S. Orlov, "Riz'blenyi kamin' 1984 r. z Chernihivs'koho dytyntsia," 26–32; V. P. Kovalenko, "Do problemy pokhodzhennia davn'orus'koï bilokam'ianoï riz'by," *Arkhitekturni ta arkheolohichni starozhytnosti Chernihivshchyny* (Chernihiv, 1992), 87–89.

23. P. A. Rappoport, "Stroitel'nye arteli Drevnei Rusi i ikh zakazchiki," *SA*, 1985 (4): 85–86; idem, "Stroitel'noe proizvodstvo Drevnei Rusi," *Russia Mediaevalis* 6, no. 1 (1987): 128–29; idem, *Drevnerusskaia arkhitektura*, 20, 27, 77.

24. V. N. Lazarev, "Iskusstvo srednevekovoi Rusi i Zapad (XI–XV vv.)," in idem, *Vizantiiskoe i drevnerusskoe iskusstvo. Stat'i i materialy* (Moscow, 1978), 232–34, 239–42; Rappoport, *Zodchestvo Drevnei Rusi*, 89–93, 95–97, 104; O. M. Ioannisian, "Osnovnye etapy razvitiia galitskogo zodchestva," *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo. Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura X–pervoi poloviny XIII v.* (Moscow, 1988), 44–58.

25. Rappoport, "Iz istorii kievo-chernigovskogo zodchestva XII v.," 61–62; idem, *Zodchestvo Drevnei Rusi*, 54–55, 58–59, 62.

26. For recent studies on this church, see Kostiantyn N. Gupalo, *Podol v drevnem Kieve* (Kiev, 1982), 111–23; Iurii S. Aseev, *Arkhitektura drevnego Kieva* (Kiev, 1982), 116–19; Mykhailo A. Sahaidak, *Davn'okyïvs'kyi Podil* (Kiev, 1991), 109–11.

27. Iu. S. Aseev, comp., *Mystetstvo Kyïvs'koï Rusi* (Kiev, 1989), 19; Avraam M. Miletskii and Petro P. Tolochko, *Park-muzei "Drevnii Kiev"* (Kiev, 1989), 53, 58; Iurii S. Aseev, "Do pytannia pro styl'ovu periodyzatsiiu arkhitektury Kyïvs'koï Rusi," *Starozhytnosti Rusi-Ukraïny. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'* (Kiev, 1994), 93; see also Mikhail K. Karger, *Drevnii Kiev*, vol. 2 (Moscow and St. Petersburg [Leningrad], 1961), 432–33.

28. Aseev, "Stilisticheskie osobennosti chernigovskogo zodchestva XII–XIII vv.," 139–40.

29. Rappoport, "Iz istorii kievo-chernigovskogo zodchestva XII v.," 62; idem, *Zodchestvo Drevnei Rusi*, 55, 80.

30. Petro P. Tolochko, *Drevnii Kiev* (Kiev, 1983), 258–70.

31. V. N. Lazarev, "Zhivopis' i skul'ptura Kievskoi Rusi," in Igor' E. Grabar' et al., eds., *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva* vol. 1 (Moscow, 1953), 215, 217, 218; idem, "Iskusstvo srednevekovoi Rusi i Zapad (XI–XV vv.)," 262; Iurii S. Aseev, *Mystetstvo starodavn'oho Kyieva* (Kiev, 1969), 154–55, 160–64; idem, *Arkhitektura drevnego Kieva*, 124–25.

32. Iurii S. Aseev, *Dzherela. Mystetstvo Kyïvs'koï Rusi* (Kiev, 1980), 156, 174. For the fresco paintings in the Assumption Cathedral in Chernihiv, see G. N. Logvin, *Chernigov, Novgorod-Severskii, Glukhov, Putivl'* (Moscow, 1965), 72, 73, 89–90; Ie. S. Mamolat, "Monumental'nyi zhyvopys," in M. P. Bazhan et al., eds., *Istoriia ukraïns'koho mystetstva*, vol. 1 (Kiev, 1966), 320; I. M. Ihnatenko, "Novi doslidzhennia Uspens'koho soboru v Chernihovi," *Slov'iano-rus'ki starozhytnosti Pivnichnoho Livoberezhzhia* (Chernihiv, 1995), 35–39; T. I. Latukha, "Graffiti Uspenskogo sobora

Eletskogo monastyria v g. Chernigove (k voprosu o nachal'nom etape kanonizatsii pravoslavnykh sviatykh na Rusi)," ibid., 49–51.

33. T. I. Latukha, "Restavratsiia fresok Uspenskogo sobora Eletskogo monastyria M. L. Boichukom," *Arkhitekturni ta arkheolohichni starozhytnosti Chernihivshchyny* (Chernihiv, 1992), 86.

34. See, for example, A. I. Rogov, "Kul'turnye sviazi Kievskoi Rusi s drugimi slavianskimi stranami v period eë khristianizatsii," *Priniatie khristianstva narodami Tsentral'noi i Iugo-Vostochnoi Evropy i kreshchenie Rusi* (Moscow, 1988), 208–20; V. G. Putsko, "Vizantiia i stanovlenie iskusstva Kievskoi Rusi," *Iuzhnaia Rus' i Vizantiia* (Kiev, 1991), 80, 81, 84, 86, 89, 92–93. See also n. 31.

35. Cf. the view of the researcher of the Chernihiv Assumption Cathedral in 1924, the architect Ipolit V. Morhilevs'kyi, who believed that both its architecture and fresco painting, with their combined Byzantine and Romanesque features, had been brought to Rus' from Dalmatia, Serbia, or Wallachia, in Latukha, "Restavratsiia fresok Uspenskogo sobora Eletskogo monastyria...," 86.

36. Rappoport, "Stroitel'nye arteli Drevnei Rusi i ikh zakazchiki," 82; idem, "Stroitel'noe proizvodstvo Drevnei Rusi," 122–23, 126.

37. Lazarev, "Zhivopis' i skul'ptura Kievskoi Rusi," 214.

38. Logvin, *Chernigov, Novgorod-Severskii...*, 82, 90; Aseev, "Stilisticheskie osobennosti chernigovskogo zodchestva XII–XIII vv.," 139.

39. Vorob'ëva and Tits, "O datirovke Uspenskogo i Borisoglebskogo soborov v Chernigove," 99–106, 108; see also n. 15.

40. Vladimir Gvozdanovic, "Pre-Romanesque and Early Romanesque Architecture in Croatia," Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1972 (microform, Ithaca, N.Y., 1972), 139, 148, 149, 154; Andre Mohorovičić, *Graditeljstvo u Hrvatskoj arhitektura i urbanizam* (Zagreb, 1992), 62. I would also like to thank Mr. Robert Moody and Ms. Jennifer Forbes, of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies of Toronto, for their kind and helpful consultation on Romanesque architecture in the Balkans.

41. Aleksandar Deroko, *Monumentalna i dekorativna arhitektura u srednjevekovnoj Srbiji* (Belgrade, 1953), 58, 60–62; Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 401.

42. Mango, *Byzantine Architecture*, 175. For Bulgarian architecture of this period see, for example, Neli Chaneva-Dechevska, *Ts"rkovnata arkhitektura v B"lgariia prez XI–XIV vek* (Sofia, 1988), especially p. 204.

43. *Romanska arhitektura na Slovenskem.* Likovno razstavišče Rihard Jakopič (Ljubljana, 1988), 3, 7, 35–41.

44. See n. 24.

The Union of Florence in the Kievan Metropolitanate: Did It Survive until the Times of the Union of Brest? (Some Reflections on a Recent Argument)

BORYS GUDZIAK

FLORENTINE ECUMENISM IN THE KYIVAN CHURCH. By *Ihor Mončak.* Rome: Editiones Universitatis Catholicae Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae, 1987 [=Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae, 53–54]. 376 pp.

The Union of Brest (1595/96), which some historians connect closely with the Union of Florence (1439),[1] is one of the *causes célèbres* in Slavic historiography, attracting considerable attention, especially among Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian historians. The recent five hundred fiftieth anniversary of the Florentine accord, together with the imminent quadricentennial of the Union of Brest, occasion reflection on history writing devoted to early modern ecclesiastical unification.[2] Controversies generated by attempts at East-West religious reconciliation have directly contributed to the development of historiography among the Slavs. It is, in fact, the Union of Brest that sparked systematic analysis of East Slavic ecclesiastical history. The first histories of the 1596 Synod of Brest appeared shortly after the synod had taken place.[3] There ensued a passionate polemic that generated a whole literature, the early part of which can be used as source material for the study of the genesis of the Union.[4] At the same time, some of the works from the polemical corpus constitute the first systematic East Slavic ecclesiastical histories.[5]

Over the four hundred years since the Brest accord, scholars have published countless volumes of primary and secondary literature on various aspects of the Union.[6] In the last decades, the sources for late sixteenth-century Ukrainian Church history have been surveyed in two Soviet publications. The first, by Iaroslav Isaievych, although focusing on the early modern Ukrainian cultural revival, comprises an overview of material that is directly or indirectly related to Ruthenian ecclesiastical developments. It catalogues relevant prerevolutionary source publications, including the work of the great nineteenth-century archeographic commissions. The discussion of later publications is limited mostly to Slavic sources.[7] The second, by Serhii Plokhyi, is a most useful introduction to the compendia of sources on Ukrainian sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Church history. Particular attention is devoted to the postwar publication of sources from the Vatican Archives, especially the numerous series sponsored by the Basilian Fathers under the direction of Athanasius Welykyj and the collection

published by St. Clement Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome.[8] The Greek sources, fewer of which have survived, have received less attention from archeographers. Isydor Sharanevych, a representative of the Russophile movement in nineteenth-century Galicia, discussed the source material in his overview of the relations between the Ruthenian Church and the Patriarchate of Constantinople.[9] The secondary literature on the Union of Brest is overwhelming, and even a general survey might easily be developed into a monograph in itself.[10]

*
* *

In the last two decades, there have been two major scholarly works on the question of the Ruthenian Church's union with Rome, which attempt to approach the issue from a new perspective. Josef Macha completed a study of the Unions of Florence and Brest, based mainly on secondary literature but introducing a methodology borrowed from the social sciences. The study consists of three parts. Using Amitai Etzioni's sociological model of political unification, Macha presents a model of ecclesiastical unification (part 1) which he applies to the Union of Florence (part 2) and the Union of Brest (part 3). Macha's work is valuable as a well-informed survey of the Brest Union and its fate in the seventeenth century.[11]

The second, more recent, contribution to the history of the Kievan Metropolitanate's relations with Rome is Ihor Mončak's theological interpretation of the legacy of the Florentine union in Ruthenian lands.[12] This work has received little notice from reviewers, although it merits attention. The study consists of two parts. The first outlines the theological-ecclesiological parameters for understanding Church unity, often neglected in historiographical examinations of ecclesiastical developments. In this part, using the principles of the Second Vatican Council as a point of departure, the author proposes working definitions of ecclesiastical "unity" (pp. 124–26), "union" (pp. 128–31), "alienation" (pp. 26, 80–81, 93–96), and "schism" (pp. 26, 69–90) in the context of the relations between "individual Churches" (e.g., ecclesiastical provinces, autonomous and autocephalous Churches, patriarchates) (pp. 28–29, 52–56, 64–65).

In the second (historical) part, Mončak presents an interesting yet ultimately unconvincing argument that Florentine unity (if not the external manifestations thereof) between the Kievan Metropolitanate and the Apostolic See in Rome endured theoretically and theologically to the end of the sixteenth century. (This thesis was often articulated by the Church historian Mykola Chubatyi). Mončak characterizes the sixteenth-century relationship between Rome and the Kievan Metropolitanate as one of involuntary "alienation" (pp. 326, 329), not schism in the "spiritual-moral sense" (p. 320). The author's historical analysis is sound in arguing that there is no evidence of official repudiation by the Kievan Metropolitanate of the Council of Florence and no clear, chronologically identi-

fiable rupture between the Kievan Church and Rome in the second half of the fifteenth and throughout the sixteenth centuries.[13] Mončak makes the most of the bits of evidence concerning the positive and enduring reception of the Florentine council and perceptively depicts the process through which narrow ecclesiological views among Latins, both in Poland-Lithuania and in Rome, alienated a Ruthenian Church periodically demonstrating unionistic impulses. He shows (esp. at pp. 226–82) how the Latins came to view the Kievan Metropolitanate not as a Church with which union could be achieved, but as a community of schismatics to be reduced to Roman obedience, and preferably to the Latin rite. However, in the absence of positive proof of a broadly based reception of the Council and of lasting communion and mutual recognition between Rome and Kiev, the author's theses of "full adhesion of the southern [Kievan] Metropolitanate to the ecumenical decisions of the Council" (p. 317) and of enduring "Florentine ecumenism" are not adequately substantiated.

In this regard Mončak does not consistently portray phenomena detrimental to his argument, including the deep-seated hostilities harbored in the Greek East towards the Latin West since the sack of Constantinople in 1204 during the Fourth Crusade and, even more so, after the calamity of 1453. The study does not address the issue of the reception of the Union of Florence in Ruthenian society at large, for which there is admittedly little or no direct evidence. To compensate, it would have been necessary to examine rigorously the question in a broader *historical* context, as opposed to an often baffling canonical-historical perspective, which allows for such statements as, "From the juridical point of view, a rejection of the Florentine union took place in Constantinople only in 1472 [actually, in 1484—Author]. Therefore, a Patriarch elected before that date should be considered a Patriarch of the Catholic faith" (p. 201).

In an age during which questions of theology, ecclesiology, and high-level ecclesiastical politics were matters far removed from most of the population, no distinct conception of, or well-defined attitude towards, ecclesiastical Rome could have prevailed in the Kievan Church. Yet if there was any "popular" notion of Rome or the papacy in the Ruthenian lands, it was assuredly more positive than that among the Greeks. This is not, however, a basis for arguing that the Union of Florence ever penetrated beyond a narrow Ruthenian ecclesiastical and lay elite. Two hundred years after the Fourth Crusade had confirmed the centuries-long process of dogmatic and cultural estrangement of Eastern and Western Christendom, the reality of this estrangement had become an evident fact of life in towns, if not villages, in Kievan lands. There, Catholic and Orthodox coexisted, and the differences and the separation between them were self-evident. After the Council of Florence, there was no substantial modification of this awareness, especially among Latins, as Mončak points out, and union with Rome assuredly did not become a part of general Ruthenian ecclesial consciousness. The limited evidence of Ruthenian communion with Rome and the nonunited status of the sixteenth-century Kievan Metropolitanate in the eyes of Polish and Lithuanian Catholics,

Rome, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Ruthenians themselves (episodic exceptions notwithstanding) render Mončak's thesis overstated, despite his numerous insightful observations. Barring the discovery of new revelatory sources demonstrating explicitly the unity of Kiev with Rome in the second half of the sixteenth century, the historian must use as a point of departure the thesis that in the heightened denominationalism of the Reformation period, the Kievan Metropolitanate came to pay exclusive ecclesiastical allegiance to the Church of Constantinople.

Nevertheless, Mončak's study makes a significant contribution towards our understanding of the reception and legacy of the Florentine union in the Kievan Metropolitanate. The author argues convincingly that an important factor undermining Florentine unification in Lithuania and Poland was the hostility of the local Roman Catholic hierarchy and clergy to both the Ruthenian Church and to its union with Rome (pp. 226–308). Particularly revealing is Mončak's discussion (pp. 235–82) of the *Elucidarius errorum ritus Ruthenici* (n.p., n.d.) written in 1501/2 by a professor and five-time rector of the Cracow Academy, Jan Sacranus.[14] Although this tract against Ruthenian "errors" took on a much wider scope, it was in part occasioned by the dispute over the necessity of rebaptism of converts to the Latin Church from the Eastern Church. Sacranus attacked the position of the Bernardine Fathers, who argued that no rebaptism was needed.

The Cracow divine sought to demonstrate that the Ruthenians were the "worst of all heretics" (much worse than the Greeks) and did not, unlike the Greeks, possess a valid hierarchy and priesthood. Hence, the Ruthenian Church could not be a partner to reconciliation with the Church of Rome. All policy should be guided by the principle that Ruthenians could only be subjects for conversion to the one true Latin faith. The list of errors was clearly intended to be overwhelming. Sacranus enumerated forty points of theological disagreement, ritual abuse, superstition, and moral perfidy, many invented or presented in an unabashedly calumnious fashion—according to Sacranus, Ruthenians as a rule sanctioned fornication and theologically rationalized the murder of Latins. The basic ideology and spirit of the Council of Florence were unequivocally repudiated. Mončak argues perceptively (pp. 239–41, 245–46) that Sacranus's more favorable view of the Greeks reveals that the work was written not to draw a readership in Poland and Lithuania away from a Greek orientation, but rather to demonstrate to an audience familiar with the Greeks that the Ruthenians compared negatively with them, and as such could not be part of the Roman communion. Such an audience could be found in Rome.

The response of the Latin ecclesiastical leadership in Poland and Lithuania to the promulgation of the Florentine accord reflects a distinct if not initially consistent tendency to identify the Catholic faith with the Latin rite. Mončak calls this the "uniformitarian" approach to ecclesiastical unity, according to which union presupposes theological, canonical, and liturgical uniformity. According to the central argument in Mončak's study, the ecclesiological positions of the

Kievan Metropolitans Isidore, Gregory, Mysaïl, and Iosyf reflect an "ecumenical" approach characterized by the spirit of the Council of Florence, according to which ecclesiastical unity of the Eastern Churches with Rome did not entail a violation of Oriental liturgical traditions or the ethos of the Eastern ecclesiastical polities. Mončak shows that these two tendencies are indeed discernible. However, in applying these categories, the author gives the impression that there existed distinct, self-conscious "uniformitarian" and "ecumenical" parties in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Poland and Lithuania. In a manner similar to the "possessor-nonpossessor" dichotomy that dominates Russian ecclesiastical historiography for this period, Mončak's historical analysis neatly sweeps individual ecclesiastical and political figures into two diametrically opposed camps, viewing their actions as examples of a premeditated faithfulness to duly formulated theological and ideological party platforms (see esp. pp. 274–76, 278–80).

As part of his argument that the post-Florentine Kievan Church sought communion with both Constantinople and Rome and that such communion was indeed possible, Mončak maintains that there is no evidence that the patriarchs of Constantinople who confirmed Kievan metropolitans—Symeon (1481–88), Iona (1489–94), and Makarii (1495–97)—"were of dissident conviction" (p. 221). However, the author does not present an argument for the opposite view. In fact, in 1484 a synod in Constantinople under the direction of Patriarch Symeon and with the participation of representatives of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem solemnly anathematized the Council of Florence and decreed that both Latins and Unionists entering or reentering the Orthodox Church were to repudiate Roman heresies and receive the sacrament of confirmation (rebaptism was not required).[15] Thus, after 1484 the burden of proof concerning the pro- or anti-union position of individual patriarchs of that period must be borne by the historian arguing for a sympathetic Constantinopolitan view of the Florentine council.

Some reservations might be expressed regarding Mončak's reading of sources and secondary literature. In discussing the letter of Metropolitan-elect Mysaïl sent to Pope Sixtus IV in 1476, Mončak (p. 203) states that "Vicar of Christ" is among the titles in the extended litany with which the letter addresses Sixtus. In the Slavonic-Middle Ruthenian we read: " . . . блаженному Сиксту, святыя вселенския *соборъныя апостольския церкви, викарию* наидостоинѣйшому во перъвых, священныхъ чыноначалия свѣтлосияющему просвѣщениемъ . . . ." (emphasis added in both citations).[16] However, it is only the Latin translation, not Mysaïl's original, that makes the nature of the vicariate more specific: " . . . beato Sixto, sanctae universalis Ecclesiae Christi Vicario. Qui a sanctissimo et summo omnium lumine intelligentia . . . illustratus."[17]

In the first letter to Grand Duke Aleksander the pope expresses disillusion with the Florentine model of "reduction" to union: " . . . huiusmodi reductio iuxta diffinitionem predicti concilii Florentini sepius tentata, et, tociens . . . interrrupta extitit . . . ."[18] Quoting this passage (p. 256), Mončak implausibly maintains that

the pope was disappointed not in Florentine union per se, and even less so in attempts to implement it in the Kievan Metropolitanate, but in unionistic endeavors throughout history. According to the author, the span of time since the Council of Florence did not include a sufficient number of unionistic attempts to merit the phrase "often tried" (p. 256). Other examples of interpretations or phrasing of an apologetic nature that serve to soften the categorical stance taken by Rome or explain papal insensitivity to the predicament of the Ruthenian Church can be found (pp. 261, 262, 265).

In developing his thesis that Florentine unity endured in the Kievan Metropolitanate through the sixteenth century, Mončak maintains that, because Władysław III granted the original guarantee of religious equality in 1443 as a result of Ruthenian acceptance of the Union of Florence, the confirmations of this decree in 1504 and 1543 constituted recognition of the survival of the Florentine unity of the Ruthenian Church. To support his contention that in this regard the religious situation in the sixteenth century was consistent with that of the fifteenth, the author (p. 283) quotes and seriously misconstrues an admittedly obtuse formulation of Halecki.[19] The sentence in Mončak, including the passage quoted from Halecki, reads as follows: "In fact, as far as these *two periods* [i.e., the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; emphasis added—Author] were concerned, 'it is impossible to discover any difference in their attitude [that of the Kyivans—I. M.] towards the problem of reunion with Rome'."

Halecki, who stated that the guarantee of 1443 "seemed to refer more specifically to the Ruthenian provinces of Poland" (as opposed to Lithuania), is making a geographical, not a chronological, comparison. Halecki opines that, although the 1443 decree originally referred only to dioceses under the Polish Crown, it eventually did have an effect in the Grand Duchy. Concerning the early sixteenth-century situation under Aleksander, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, Halecki writes: "But all of the dioceses in the Eastern rite of both Jagellonian States, now again under one ruler, were under the Metropolitan of Kiev, and it is impossible to discover any difference in their attitude towards the problem of reunion with Rome." Thus, the antecedent for the third person plural possessive adjective "their" modifying "attitude" is "the dioceses," not "the Kievans" of two different centuries, as Mončak interpolates. The misunderstanding is surprising, since in the same paragraph Halecki states the *opposite* of what Mončak, using Halecki as an authority, is trying to prove. For Halecki, Władysław III's privileges acted as a "bill of rights for all followers of the Eastern rite" in the sixteenth century because "in the course of the sixteenth century the condition [for extending these rights to Eastern Christians—Author] of remaining in union with Rome according to the decisions of the Council of Florence was frequently disregarded." Thus, according to Halecki the rights of the Ruthenians were respected even though in the sixteenth century they no longer accepted the Florentine union. Mončak repeats this inverted interpretation of Halecki's words as part of his argument in the conclusion (p. 318).

A minor point, yet one germane to the author's argument concerning the consciousness of Ruthenians regarding the relationship of the Kievan Church with the patriarchate: Mončak states that "in the desperate decisions of the Synod of Vilno [1509], there was a complete lack of reference to the Patriarchate of Constantinople" (p. 287). However, in condemning widowed priests who kept mistresses the synod in fact invoked the discipline that the "Ecumenical Great Constantinopolitan Church preserves."[20]

The volume has a number of useful features. The argumentation is made accessible to the nonspecialist by an appendix in which most (but not all) of the Latin sources quoted by the author are rendered in English translation. This appendix also gives quotations from sources supplementing the information given in footnotes in the text. Indices for theological terms, persons and places, chronological tables for popes, patriarchs, and archbishops of Kiev, as well as a genealogy of Lithuanian grand princes are provided at the end of the volume. Unfortunately, there are numerous typographical errors throughout. The style of the narrative and of the translations of sources reflect not only the realities of in-house publishing, but also the difficulties of producing an elegant English-language edition in a non-English-speaking environment (Italy).

Even if it did not have the reception and lasting legacy ascribed to it by Father Mončak, the Union of Florence has an important place in the history of the Kievan Metropolitanate. The known sources do not allow for categorical judgments, but to this author it seems evident that the Florentine accord was in fact accepted by the Ruthenian ecclesiastical and civil elite. Although the promulgation of the union did not reach all levels of the Ruthenian Church and society, for more than half a century it served to condition positions taken by the hierarchy of the Kievan Metropolitanate. The status of the Kievan Metropolitanate in the period after the Union of Florence does not fit neatly into the confessional categories (Greek-Latin, East-West, Orthodox-Catholic) used, then and now, to characterize the rest of pre-Reformation Christendom. It was only a century later that the restrictive quality of the ecclesiological adjectives came to be established. The Greek/Latin or East/West appellations for the Churches prevalent until the end of the sixteenth century implicitly reflected a consciousness of mutuality, that is, a sense that the two were only parts of one Church of Christ.[21]

Despite the fact that the Kievan Metropolitanate had always been a daughter of Constantinople, it rarely entered into the ecclesiastical and dogmatic conflicts between the Byzantine Church and her sister, the Church of Rome.[22] Like a child in the midst of chronic familial discord, the Kievan Church occasionally repeated formulations overheard from a distant debate, but for the most part avoided or even ignored the conflict within the senior generation. In the first five centuries after the establishment of Christianity in Rus', a voice from the Kievan lands concerning the theological controversies between the Latin and Greek Churches had been rare. There had been anti-Latin writings composed in Rus', but like much of Rus' literature, they relied heavily on Byzantine prototypes. Furthermore, the authors

of the polemical tracts written in Rus' were almost exclusively Greeks, who came to Rus' lands as appointees to the Kievan Metropolitanate or as monks.[23]

Allegiance to the Patriarchate of Constantinople did not preclude direct contacts of Kievan metropolitans with the Western Church. The hierarchs of Kiev had appeared at international ecclesiastical fora in the West—the Councils of Lyons (1245), Constance, and Florence—evincing a conciliatory position regarding the Greek-Latin dialectic. To be sure, in each of these cases the Eastern Church or its representative hierarch was in a difficult predicament and was seeking aid from the West. Nevertheless, a distinct pattern is evident: recurring manifestations of affinity to the Church of Rome without abrogating ties to the mother Church in Constantinople. After Florence, the lack of confessional ardor continues. Like the eleventh-century break between Rome and Constantinople, the failure of the Union of Florence was inherited by the Ruthenian Church from the Churches of Constantinople and Rome, and assimilated only gradually, and completely perhaps only on the eve of the Union of Brest.

The factors accounting for the lack of absolutist tendencies in dogmatic and ecclesiological questions separating the Eastern and Western Churches underlie much of Ukrainian (and to some extent Belarusian) ecclesiastical, and indeed cultural and political, history.[24] Given the present state of scholarship on medieval and early modern East Slavic cultural and religious life, the complex genesis of a Ruthenian theological stance straddling the East-West divide can be explained only partially, and in the form of hypotheses. The issue of locus is central in this regard. *Inter alia,* the geographical and intellectual remoteness of the Kievan Metropolitanate from the respective jurisdictional and theological centers of the opposing Greek and Latin ecclesiastical worlds conditioned the development of Ukrainian and Belarusian Christianity, its theological life, and its ecclesiological orientation. Other historical contingencies, such as the limited or selective transmission of the Byzantine legacy to Rus', the lack of a strong East Slavic philosophical tradition, and the late development of formal schools, contributed to the relatively low level of interest in questions of Trinitarian theology or even ecclesiology. To put it simply, the Greek-Latin theological differences largely bypassed the Church of Kiev. They did not reflect the internal exigencies of ecclesiastical life in its dioceses and resonated only weakly in internal church policy and politics. The situation to the northeast was different. Although Trinitarian doctrine and other theological considerations, understood in strict terms, were not irrelevant, it was primarily the political and ideological context in Muscovy that conditioned the resolutely negative response and increasingly strident polemics, which contrasted with the attitude towards Florence in Ukrainian and Belarusian lands.[25] The ambivalence in the Kievan Metropolitanate on the confessional and theological divide, bemoaned by those evaluating and judging historical periods according to particular standards of theological development or sophistication, was clearly evident in the decades after Florence.[26]

*

* *

The issue of ecclesiastical union between Rome and the Kievan Metropolitanate is a dominant theme in early modern Ukrainian history. On the occasion of the anniversary of the Union of Brest, it can be expected that much literature will be produced reflecting the heightened interconfessional tensions prevailing in postcommunist Eastern Europe. For Ukrainian studies, but also for Ukrainian society at large, it is important that scholars develop new perspectives on controversial religious issues. Despite its shortcomings, *Florentine Ecumenism,* combining theological and historical analyses, along with Macha's *Ecclesiastical Unification,* synthesizing historical and sociological methods, are examples of innovative, interdisciplinary scholarship that should serve to stimulate new approaches to topics in Church history that have been exhausted by traditional methodologies.

L'viv Theological Academy

NOTES

1. The most comprehensive argumentation in this vein is presented by Oscar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)* (Rome, 1958 [=*Sacrum Poloniae Millennium* 5]; New York, 1959), 123–24.

2. The most significant publication of conference proceedings marking the anniversary of the Florentine union is Giuseppe Alberigo, ed., *Christian Unity: The Council of Ferrara-Florence, 1438/39–1989* (Leuven, 1991) [=Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 97].

3. For example, Piotr Skarga, *Synod Brzeski i iego obrona* (Cracow, 1597), Ipatii Potii, *Spravedlyvoe opysan'e postupku i spravy sobora beresteiskoho* (Vilnius, 1597), and the anonymous Orthodox work *Ekthesis abo krótkie zebranie spraw, które się działy na partykularnym, to iest pomiastnym synodzie w Brześciu Litewskim* (Cracow, 1597).

4. See L. Ie. Makhnovets', ed., *Ukraïns'ki pys'mennyky. Bio-bibliohrafichnyi slovnyk,* vol. 1, *Davnia ukraïns'ka literatura (XI–XVIII st. st.)* (Kiev, 1960). For a useful chronology of the development of the polemical corpus, with Polish or Ruthenian Catholic and Orthodox works listed on facing pages, see Mykhailo Vozniak, *Istoriia ukraïns'koï literatury,* vol. 2, *Viky XVI–XVIII* (L'viv, 1921), 356–76.

5. The works of Potii, Lev Kreuza's *Obrona iedności cerkiewney* (Vilnius, 1617) and Zakhariia Kopystens'kyi's *Palinodiia;* the latter two reprinted as vol. 3 in the Texts series, *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1987).

6. The most complete list of primary and secondary literature on the Union of Brest is found in Isydor Patrylo's bibliography of Ukrainian Church history, which, for the early modern period, is rather a bibliography of the history of the Kievan Metropolitanate, including ecclesiastical life of Belarusian lands. *Dzherela i bibliohrafiia do istoriï Ukraïns'koï tserkvy,* 2 vols. (Rome, 1975–88) [=*AOSBM* ser. 2, sec. 1, 33, 46]. Originally appeared as "Dzherela i Bibliohrafiia do istoriï Ukraïins'koï Tserkvy," pt. 1, *AOSBM* ser. 2, sec. 2, 8 (1973): 305–434; pt. 2, 9 (1974): 325–545; pt. 3, 10 (1979): 406–87; pt. 4, 12 (1985): 419–516; pt. 5, 13 (1988): 405–538.

7. *Dzherela z istoriï ukraïns'koï kul'tury doby feodalizmu XVI–XVIII st.* (Kiev, 1972).

8. S. N. Plokhii [S. M. Plokhyi], *Bor'ba ukrainskogo naroda s katolicheskoi ekspansiei XVI–XVII v.v.* (Dnipropetrovs'k: DDU, 1987). The most important documents concerning the Union of Brest are

compiled in a volume, *Documenta Unionis Berestensis eiusque auctorum (1590–1600),* ed. A. G. Welykyj, *Analecta OSBM* ser. 2, sec. 3 (Rome, 1970).

9. Izydor Szaraniewicz, "Patryjarchat wschodni wobec Kościoła ruskiego i Rzeczypospolitej polskiej z źródeł współczesnych," in *Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego Akademii Umiejętności* (Cracow, 1879), no. 8, pp. 255–344; no. 10, pp. 1–80; sources surveyed on pp. 255–65; Ukrainian translation in *Ruskii Sion* (1879): 599–606, 625–30, 662–66, 694–700, 727–30; (1880): 5–7, 35–37, 69–71, 97–100, 148–51, 169–71, 201–4, 233–36, 265–68, 331–35. Ivan Sokolov, who devoted considerable attention to the nineteenth-century history of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, provided an outline of the ecclesiastical relations between the Kievan Metropolitanate and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the sixteenth and at the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. See his "Pro vidnosyny Ukraïns'koï tserkvy do Hrets'koho skhodu na prykintsi XVI ta na pochatku XVII st. za novovydanymy materiialamy. Istorychnyi narys," *Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu Vseukraïns'koï akademiï nauk,* 1919 (1): 53–84.

10. See Father Patrylo's annotated bibliography, which is quite complete for the Brest period.

11. Josef Macha, *Ecclesiastical Unification: A Theoretical Framework Together with Case Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations* (Rome, 1974) [=Orientalia Christiana Analecta 198].

12. Ihor Mončak, *Florentine Ecumenism in the Kyivan Church* (Rome, 1987) [=Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae 53–54].

13. The author continues the argument in a subsequent article, "The Kievan Church during the Councils of Florence and Brest," in *Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine: A Symposium,* ed. Joseph Andrijisyn (Ottawa: University of St. Paul, 1987), 225–51.

14. Sacranus (the name comes from a Latinized version of his birthplace, Oświęcim [Sacranum]) studied in Cracow (1459–69) and in Italy (1470–75), mostly in Rome. Having returned to Cracow, he taught at the Faculty of Arts in the Academy and was twice dean before moving permanently to the Faculty of Theology. About Sacranus, see *Słownik polskich teologów katolickich,* s. v. "Jan z Oświęcimia (1443–1527)," vol. 2 (Warsaw, 1982), 142–43; *Polski słownik biograficzny*, s.v. "Jan z Oświęcimia," 10:467–68. The *Elucidarius* enjoyed a number of reprintings during the sixteenth century. It was republished in 1507 or 1508 as *Errores atrocissimorum Ruthenorum* (n.p., n.d.), see Buchyns'kyi, "Zmahannia do uniï," bk. 6, p. 51. The list of errors in the *Elucidarius* was substantially reproduced by the Polish primate, Archbishop of Gniezno Jan Łaski (or by someone in his suite), in a memorandum on the errors of the Ruthenians intended for, but probably never submitted to, the Fifth Lateran Council; published by A. I. Turgenev, *Historica Russiae monumenta,* 3 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1841–48), 1:123–27. Petro Bilaniuk devotes much space to the discussion of Łaski's report, including commentary on each of the listed errors. Bilaniuk provides an English translation of Łaski's text and compares the original Latin with the text of the *Elucidarius,* see his *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512–1517) and the Eastern Churches,* 87–154. See also Jan Krajcar, "A Report on the Ruthenians and Their Errors, Prepared for the Fifth Lateran Council," *OCP* 29 (1963): 79–94. The list of errors, along with other sections of the *Elucidarius,* was published again by Jan Łasicki, *De Russorum, Moscovitarum, et Tartarorum religione, sacrificiis, nuptiarum, funerum ritu e diversis scriptoribus* (Speyer [Spiria], 1582), 184–219 (non vid.), see Eugeniusz Jarra, "Twórczość prawna duchowieństwa polskiego (966–1800)," in *Sacrum Poloniae Millennium,* vol. 1 (Rome, 1954), 281, n. 1. The *Elucidarius* was reproduced in Alessandro Guagnini, *Rerum Polonicarum tomi tres* (Frankfurt, 1584); cited in *Słownik polskich teologów katolickich* 2: 143 (here *post quem* date of the *Errores atrocissimorum* edition is given as 1527).

15. Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (London, 1968), 288.

16. *Monumenta Ucrainae historica,* comp. Andrei Sheptyts'kyi et al., vol. 1 (Rome, 1964), 8.

17. *MUH* 1: 31.

18. *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia,* ed. Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. 1 (Rome, 1953), no. 104, p. 181 [=*Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni,* ser. 2, sec. 3, vol. 1].

19. Oscar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596),* 123–24.

20. See Metropolitan Makarii [Bulgakov], *Istoriia Russkoi tserkvi,* 12 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1877–), vol. 9; reprinted Düsseldorf, 1968, pp. 166–76.

21. Concerning the late (i.e., modern) development of the restrictive, mutually exclusive connotation of the terms "Catholic" and "Orthodox," see Vittorio Peri, "Le vocabulaire des relations entre les Églises d'Occident et d'Orient jusqu'au XVIe siècle," *Irenikon* 65 (1992): 194–99.

22. For a survey of post-Byzantine Greek Orthodox theological concerns and emphases for the years 1453–1629, see Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821). Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens* (Munich, 1988), 79–180. Podskalsky has outlined the relationship between the theology of Kievan Rus' and Byzantium in the medieval period; see his *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237)* (Munich, 1982).

23. For a discussion of Rus' polemical literature, see Andrei Nikolaevich Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyi obzor drevnerusskikh polemicheskikh sochinenii protiv latinian (XI-XV v.)* (Moscow, 1875; reprinted, London, 1972) and the monographic review of Popov's book by Aleksei Stepanovich Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty po istorii drevneishei greko-russkoi polemiki protiv latinian* (St. Petersburg, 1878); see also Podskalsky, *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237),* 170–85. For a general discussion of the relations between Kievan Rus' and Latin Christendom, see Sophia Senyk, *A History of the Church in Ukraine,* vol. 1, *To the End of the Thirteenth Century* (Rome, 1993), 298–326.

24. These factors have yet to be systematically (and dispassionately) explored. Such a study entailing a comprehensive interpretation of Ukrainian history in a very broad context perhaps can be undertaken in the post-Soviet reality, which allows for accessibility of sources and methodological sharing between scholars from East and West.

25. See Michael Cherniavsky, "The Reception of the Council of Florence in Muscovy," *Church History* 24, no. 4 (1955): 347–59, here 350–57; Ihor Ševčenko, "The Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence,"*Church History* 25, no. 4 (1955): 291–323; reprinted as chapter IX in his *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World.* London: Variorum Reprints, 1982; here 306–309, 319, n. 8.

26. See, for example, Georges Florovsky's *Puti russkogo bogosloviia* (Paris, 1937); English translation *Ways of Russian Theology,* 2 vols. (Belmont, Mass., 1979–87) [=Collected Works of Georges Florovsky 5–6], in which the author, using the Greek patristic period as a model, considers most of East Slavic history theologically fruitless or counterproductive, discounting the Rus' period almost completely and generally disparaging the dynamic but "pseudomorphous" early modern (especially seventeenth-century) ecclesiastical and theological developments in Ukraine and Belarus. For critiques of Florovsky, see Francis J. Thomson, "Peter Mogila's Ecclesiastical Reforms and the Ukrainian Contribution to Russian Culture. A Critique of Georges Florovsky's Theory of the 'Pseudomorphosis of Orthodoxy'," *Slavica Gandensia* 20 (1993): 67–119; Frank E. Sysyn, "Peter Mohyla and the Kiev Academy in Recent Western Works: Divergent Views on Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Culture," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. Special Issue. The Kiev Mohyla Academy. Commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)* 8, no. 1/2 (June 1984): 160–70.

An Important Step towards Recovering the Past

I. S. KOROPECKYJ

MYKHAILO TUHAN-BARANOVS'KYI. By *S. M. Zlupko*. L'viv: Kameniar, 1993. 192 pp.
POLITYCHNA EKONOMIIA. By *M. I. Tuhan-Baranovs'kyi*. Introduction, "Mykhailo Ivanovych Tuhan-Baranovs'kyi—myslytel', vchenyi, hromadianyn," by *Larysa Horkina*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1994. 262 pp.

It seems that the almost simultaneous appearance of two very similar works about the world-renowned economist Mykhailo Tuhan-Baranovs'kyi (1865–1919)[1] can be explained more by inevitability than by coincidence. The idea behind the publication of these books has been a pressing need to acquaint the scholarly community, as well as the general public both in Ukraine and abroad, with the contributions of Tuhan, a scholar who together with Ievhen Sluts'kyi[2] has undoubtedly been this country's most important economist, and who has enjoyed a worldwide reputation. These publications were inevitable in present-day Ukraine after years of official neglect or distortion of his work under the Soviet regime as well as the official ban on any objective research on the scholar. The books under review are in line with many similar attempts in other disciplines to revive and publicize fully and objectively the Ukrainian intellectual heritage in all its complexity. Both of the authors have been prominent participants in this intellectual endeavor.[3]

The nearly simultaneous appearance of the two books is not a case of deliberate duplication. In view of the political and intellectual gulf between Kiev and L'viv, it is certain that each author prepared her/his book without being aware of the other's undertaking. This geographic factor is also responsible for the somewhat different approach taken by the two; Stepan Zlupko, a resident of L'viv, includes more information on Tuhan's participation in Ukrainian political and scholarly life than Kiev-based Larysa Horkina, who is primarily concerned with the analysis of the scholar's contribution to economics.[4] Zlupko is a prominent and prolific scholar in economic history and the history of economic thought in Ukraine. His impressive scholarly output would have been even greater had it not been for his political difficulties with the preceding regime, including official censure with the accompanying loss of a teaching position and a prohibition on publishing. Horkina, a leading Ukrainian historian of economic thought, has authored numerous works on the development of economics, primarily in the nineteenth century.

The depth of her scholarship has become evident only with the disintegration of the Soviet system, when she is no longer fettered with expectations of toeing the official line.

In addition to the same topic, these books even share a similar format. They begin with an extensive introduction, followed by Tuhan's popular text on political economy in the case of Horkina and, in the case of Zlupko, three representative articles (two of them on cooperatives).[5] Obviously, of present interest are the introductions of the two authors. Both have been written not only with economists in mind, but also the general public—hence their accessibility. The authors should be congratulated for being able to get rid of Soviet stereotypes with respect to terminology as well as style.

Since Tuhan was a scholar with views on a broad range of interests extending well beyond economics, the authors have had to deal with several topics, although their stresses and priorities vary. Dissatisfied with both the (at the time prevailing) marginalist and labor theories of value, considered separately, Tuhan attempted to merge them into a single theory encompassing both approaches. The solution proved to be less satisfactory than the formulation—now known as the neoclassical theory and generally accepted—put forward by Alfred Marshall at about the same time. Horkina's analysis of this topic seems to be somewhat more thoughtful than Zlupko's. Tuhan's so-called social theory of distribution, based on marginalist theory but also including the element of bargaining power of workers, capital owners, and land owners, contains some original ideas. In this respect Tuhan underscores the importance of labor unions for improving the workers' standard of living in a free market economy. Both authors handle this subject competently. They are also good in explaining Tuhan's pioneering research on business cycles. The emphasis on the periodicity of business fluctuations and rejection of the Marxian explanation of this phenomenon, demonstration of the disproportion between investment and saving, scaling down the exclusive attention to the supply side while moving the demand side to the foreground of business cycle research, and the determination of fluctuations in the producer goods sector as the cause of business cycles, proved to be of pathbreaking importance for research in this field and earned Tuhan well-deserved world recognition in the profession.

Both authors are successful in analyzing Tuhan's views on various aspects of Marxian theory, which, incidentally, they themselves strongly criticize and reject. The importance of this topic in the scholar's life and work was obvious, considering Marx's presence in the political as well as scholarly discourse in the Russian Empire at the time. Tuhan rejected the basic propositions of Marxism (e.g., the monistic explanation of value by labor, and thus its consequences, such as the theory of exploitation, crises, class struggle, etc.), while agreeing with its criticism of capitalism, the increasing concentration theory, and—but only in part—the materialistic explanation of history.

Tuhan considered himself a socialist throughout his life, with views close to those of German *Katheder-Sozialismus*, as expressed primarily by Adolf Wagner.

This non-Marxist socialism allows for private ownership and free market activity, while advocating at the same time an activist role for the government. His goal was a socialist society in which workers would be liberated from capitalist oppression and given the opportunity to make their own decisions with respect to their work. This future would come into being not only through blind economic forces, as claimed by orthodox Marxists, but also as a result of conscious human activity. His attention to the ideas of the so-called "utopian socialists"—whose attempts both to foresee and shape the future society, but no less importantly to implement these ideas—should be understood in this light. In addition to the expanding state capitalism and the growing syndicalism in the West, the conscious activity of people, mostly through the organization of cooperatives, should, in his view, promote the arrival of a humane socialist state. As Tuhan often repeats, this is of course a radically different vision from the centralized command over the economy as well as the individual implied by Marxist tradition. Not surprisingly, most of his time shortly prior to and during World War I was devoted to researching and popularizing the cooperative movement. He saw great possibilities, particularly for commercial and financial cooperatives, as well as for some cooperative ventures in agriculture. Zlupko presents an especially insightful and rounded view of Tuhan's theoretical and practical activity in this area.

Despite the similarity of subject matter, there are nevertheless a few marked differences between the two treatments. For example, Horkina provides a useful overview of the status of economic science at the turn of the century as a background to Tuhan's activities. On the other hand, only Zlupko analyzes Tuhan's well-known and influential book *The Russian Factory*, which has been an important contribution to the field of economic history. In it Tuhan rejects the *narodnik* (populist) view of a specifically Russian road in economic development, but instead traces capitalist development (mostly along Marxian lines) in this vast empire. He also mentions the fact that Tuhan, dealing with the problems of social classes, business cycle consequences, and other theoretical issues, was by the same token a competent (economic) sociologist—for Joseph Schumpeter a fundamental characteristic for an economist.[6]

Another difference between the authors' approaches is Horkina's focus on a theoretical analysis of the most important areas of Tuhan's oeuvre, while Zlupko takes a much broader view. He provides a detailed biography and an overview of Tuhan's manifold activities as a politician (member of the Constitutional-Democratic Party in Russia; briefly a minister of finance in the Ukrainian government, 1917–18), as a scholar (correspondent for various journals, cofounder of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, President of the Ukrainian Society of Economists), pedagogue (professor and dean of various universities), and social activist (president of the Ukrainian cooperative society, editor of a cooperative journal). An important theme of Zlupko's introduction is his attempt to prove beyond any doubt that Tuhan was throughout his life a politically conscious Ukrainian. This is a rather difficult proposition to defend in the case of a person who by birth was

half-Ukrainian and half-Tatar, lived much of his life outside Ukraine, was educated in Russian schools and lived in the milieu of Russian culture and scholarship, according to some witnesses spoke Ukrainian poorly, and was sometimes accused of being inclined to change his views often. To prove his point, Zlupko uses arguments which at times seem to be rather stretched.

Both Horkina and Zlupko fail to discuss some areas of Tuhan's research, for example, his work on monetary economics. They also fail to review the impact of Kantian philosophy on Tuhan's work, so well described in an early but still relevant monograph on him by his favorite student, later a well-known economist in his own right, Nikolai Kondratieff.[7] Finally, except for a few titles, neither of the writers refers to the significant Tuhaniana in Western languages, especially in German, during the interwar period.[8]

As was stated above, the books under review are part of an attempt to recover for Ukrainian culture and scholarship an area neglected and mistreated by the tsarist and subsequently by the Soviet regime. Both books fulfill this role laudably. But the task before Ukrainian students of Tuhan's economics—especially those of the post-Soviet generation, already trained in modern Western economics—should be to elevate our understanding of the scholar's work. In particular, some of Tuhan's lesser-known ideas might deserve more attention than they have hitherto received. In economic science, as in any other science, some important ideas have been arrived at independently by more than one scholar. At times, certain such derived ideas are subsequently attributed to all of their discoverers, while in other cases some of the creative personalities do not live long enough to enjoy the attribution, or never receive this honor at all.

There is an additional reason for the West's inadequate acquaintance with Tuhan's contributions. His works appeared originally in the Russian and, at the end of his life, in the Ukrainian language, and not all of them have been translated into Western languages. It would be a significant contribution on the part of the young generation of Ukrainian economists to rectify such an omission with respect to this outstanding scholar.

Some of Tuhan's contributions, for example those on business cycles, have long been recognized as an undoubtedly universal achievement. But new insights may still be gained from his work. (Incidentally, last year was the centennial of his pioneering work's appearance.) For example, Tuhan argued that, as a result of capitalists' drive to maximize profits and accumulate capital, overinvestment in capital goods industries takes place; a shift in output from consumer goods to producer goods industries is noticed. The consequent decrease in producer goods prices, reinforced by tightening of bank credit, leads to a decline in the entire national economy. His views may be pertinent to the ongoing discussion about whether business fluctuations are generated primarily by intersectoral shifts in demand,[9] or equally by these shifts and disturbances in the level of aggregate demand, taking into account the imperfect intersectoral mobility of resources.[10] Also, the recent publication in English of his historic work *The Russian Factory*[11]

suggests its potential for providing a better understanding of economic development in the former tsarist empire.

Recently an attempt has been made to show that Tuhan anticipated various ideas of modern monetary economics without having received in this regard any professional recognition in the West.[12] In view of the business fluctuations and financial dislocations caused by wars, he foresaw the need for governments to actively conduct anticyclical and anti-inflationary monetary policy. For this purpose he utilized the quantity theory of money, the only such theory available at the time. To make it functional, he suggested substituting money based on gold with paper money. However, he saw such a policy effective only within a worldwide framework of international agreements. Subsequent developments in economic theory and policy have confirmed Tuhan's prescience in this respect, but only about half a century later.

I submit that Tuhan's work anticipated a number of other important developments in contemporary economics. Three areas come to mind. First, Tuhan's distribution theory was not as influential as his other work.[13] Nevertheless, his notion of combining the productivity factor with the market power of economic actors with respect to wage determination may have found an echo in modern distribution theory, particularly in its neo-Marxian version.[14] To connect these temporally distant ideas would be a promising area of future research. Second, in his work on various types of cooperatives Tuhan was rather pessimistic as to the future of productive cooperatives. Recent interest in worker-owned and managed enterprises seems to contradict this view.[15] It would be of interest to investigate the reasons for the divergence between Tuhan's theoretical insights and the recent more rigorous theory as well as the empirical evidence. Third, despite Francis Fukuyama's pessimistic predictions about the end of history, it is certain that some people will continue to think and dream of an ideally equitable society. Since Marxist socialism seems to have been irreversibly discredited, these people will be looking toward other kinds of socialism for inspiration. Tuhan's writings on non-Marxist socialism could provide an excellent starting point for such a quest.

Temple University

NOTES

1. For the best bibliography of Tuhan-Baranovs'kyi's own works, works about him, and references to him, see Sergio Amato, *Ricerca bibliografica su M. I. Tugan Baranovskij (1865–1919)* (Florence: Università di Firenze-Facoltà di Magistero, 1980).

2. Known under the name Eugene Slutsky in the West.

3. Stepan Zlupko, *Serhii Podolyns'kyi—vchenyi, myslytel', revoliutsioner* (L'viv, 1990); *Ivan Franko—ekonomist* (L'viv, 1992); lectures at L'viv State University, "Ukrains'ka ekonomichna dumka v dobu Het'manshchyny"(1993), "Ekonomichna dumka v Zakhidnii Ukraïni kintsia XVIII-pershoï polovyny XIX st." (1994), "Ukraïns'ka ekonomichna dumka v personaliiakh" (1994), "Ekonomichna istoriia Ukraïny" (1995), and several articles in journals and newspapers. Larysa Horkina, in addition

to various journal articles, has written a survey of the work of several prerevolutionary economists in Ukraine, entitled *Narysy z istoriï politychnoï ekonomiï v Ukraïni* (Kiev, 1994).

4. In her recent article, "Nova epokha v istoriï ekonomichnoï nauky. Teoriia ekonomichnykh tsykliv M. I. Tuhana-Baranovs'koho," *Visnyk Natsional'noï akademiï nauk Ukraïny*, 1994, no. 11-12, Horkina analyzes the scholar's pioneering and seminal contribution in the field of business cycles.

5. "Vplyv idei politychnoï ekonomiï na pryrodoznavstvo ta filosofiiu," *Zapysky sotsial'no-ekonomichnoho viddilu* 1 (1923)(English translation, "The Influence of Ideas of Political Economy on the Natural Sciences and Philosophy," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 8 (1973-1977); "Ostannia meta kooperatsiï," *Ukraïns'ka kooperatsiia*, July 1918; "Produktsiini pidpryiemstva kooperatyviv z tochky pohliadu kooperatyvnoï teoriï," ibid., February 1918.

6. See an informative and incisive paper by Nicholas W. Balabkins, "Tuhan-Baranovsky's Relevance Today," presented at the Second Congress of the International Ukrainian Economic Association in Odessa, May 1994, and to be published in the proceedings of this congress in 1995.

7. Nikolai Kondrat'ev, *Mikhail Ivanovich Tugan-Baranovskii* (Petrograd, 1923).

8. The relative ignorance of Tuhan's contributions on the part of English-speaking economists can be attributed to the fact that most of his work has not been translated into this language. Of his perhaps most important contribution, *Promyshlennye krizisy v sovremennoi Anglii* (1894), only selected excerpts have been translated in the *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 3 (Spring 1954).

9. E.g., David M. Lilien, "Sectoral Shifts and Cyclical Unemployment," *Journal of Political Economy* 90 (August 1982).

10. E.g., Katharine G. Abraham and Lawrence F. Katz, "Cyclical Unemployment: Sectoral Shifts or Aggregate Disturbances?" *Journal of Political Economy* 94 (June 1986).

11. *The Russian Factory,* translation from the third Russian edition, by Arthur Levin and Clara S. Levin, under the supervision of Gregory Grossman (Homewood, Ill.: R. D. Irwin, 1970). Incidentally, in this book Tuhan makes several references to the developments in Ukraine.

12. See I. S. Koropeckyj, "The Contribution of Mykhailo Tuhan-Baranovsky to Monetary Economics," *History of Political Economy* 23 (Spring 1991). Probably because of war conditions, his main work on the subject, *Bumazhnye den'gi i metall* (Petrograd, 1917), was not even noted in the West until its recent translation into Italian, A. Graziani and A. Graziosi, eds., *Carta moneta e metallo* (Naples and Rome, 1987).

13. See, for example, Joseph A. Schumpeter, *History of Economic Analysis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), 1126, n. 9.

14. E.g., David M. Gordon, "Distribution Theories: Marxian," in John Eatwell et al., eds., *The New Palgrave* 1 (New York: The Stockton Press, 1987) and the bibliography cited therein. On the problem of the power of an enterprise, see John Kenneth Galbraith, "Power and the Useful Economist," *American Economic Review* 63 (March 1973).

15. See, for example, Frederic L. Pryor, "The Economics of Production Co-operatives: A Reader's Guide," *Annals of Public and Co-operative Economy* 2 (1983) and the extensive bibliography cited therein, including several important contributions by Jaroslav Vanek from Cornell University.

REVIEWS

LETTERATURA DELLA SLAVIA ORTODOSSA (IX–XVIII SEC.). By *Riccardo Picchio*. Bari: Edizioni Dedalo, 1991. 546 pp.

This is a collection of articles, most published earlier, one for the first time here; they are all in Italian, although the first publication of some was in English or Bulgarian. There is an index.

Just as it is not necessary to present the author to the readers of this journal, so it seems almost superfluous to recommend the author's mastery of the topics he writes on and his lively style. The collected articles, arranged as fifteen chapters, regard broad questions of Orthodox Slavic literature (and whoever is still unconvinced about the appropriateness of the term should read chapter 1, "Slavia ortodossa e Slavia romana"), as well as the literature of Rus′ from medieval times to Lomonosov, and Bulgarian literature.

The volume is a useful introduction to the study of the older Slavic literature by a scholar with broad humanistic interests and penetration. Articles such as the one defining Orthodox and Roman Slavdom, or on the Church Slavic language (chap. 3), and on Bulgarian literature in the context of European medieval culture (chap. 5), written with scholarly rigor, are an excellent introduction to these topics for an educated reader interested in the culture of Eastern Europe or seeking to broaden his horizons of the European Middle Ages through the inclusion of its eastern reaches.

I have only a few comments. In chapter 9 the author, in a highly original but not entirely convincing study, professes to see biblical echoes especially in the *Slovo o polku Igoreve.* Chapter 8, on the other hand, on "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of Slavia Orthodoxa," is an extremely important study not of biblical echoes merely, but of the conscious application of biblical and, more broadly, "spiritual" themes and principles in medieval Slavic literature. It is rich in insights and should stimulate other scholars, as the author hopes, to study single works from the aspect of scriptural themes. Perhaps because the topic of biblical motifs in literary works of a markedly religious culture is so obvious, it has not been studied in any depth. In his own article the author briefly analyzes a number of works, mostly hagiographic lives, to demonstrate his method and the results that can be achieved. Chapter 12, on the new rhetoric that progressively transformed literature in sixteenth-century Rus′ (Muscovy and the Ruthenian lands) offers new insights into this subject.

A number of articles deal with specialized themes: the problems posed by the transmission and transcription of Russian epic songs, not much different from the transmission of "literary" works (chap. 2); the Trojan motif in the *Slovo o polku Igoreve* (chap. 10); the legend about Peter and Fevronija of Murom′ (chap. 11); the language of Paisij of Hilandar (chap. 13); Christopher Žefarovič (chap. 14); and Lomonosov as a spokesman of Russian confessional patriotism (chap. 15). Chapters 6 and 7 deal with questions of isocolism in, respectively, Slavic and Russian literature.

The author approaches every topic in a fresh manner, with a vast and intimate knowledge of Slavic culture, and frequently opens new views on well-known subjects. The publisher is to be commended for making these articles, scattered in specialized journals, available to a broader public.

Sophia Senyk
Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome

ORIENTE BARBARICO E STORIOGRAFIA SETTECENTESCA. RAPPRESENTAZIONI DELLA STORIA DEI TARTARI NELLA CULTURA FRANCESE DEL XVIII SECOLO. By *Rolando Minuti*. Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1994. 195 pp.

In Voltaire's *Philosophical Letters* of 1734 he dismissed as frivolous the idea that a conqueror could be considered the greatest man in history, and he offered up a list that included Caesar, Alexander, Tamerlane, and Cromwell, only to find them all equally unworthy of comparison with a man of science like Sir Isaac Newton. Rolando Minuti takes this list as the point of departure for an extraordinary new book on the Tatars in the historiography of the Enlightenment, which begins by posing the question of why the name of Tamerlane was included on Voltaire's list of top conquerors. That inclusion was not casual, according to Minuti, and so, beginning with the famous figures of Tamerlane and Genghis Khan, and moving on to the Enlightenment's general intellectual engagement with the Tatars, the book reveals an aspect of eighteenth-century philosophical history that has remained quite obscure until now. In fact, as revealed and elucidated by Minuti with superb insight and exemplary scholarship, the subject of the Tatars appears essential for rethinking some of the most important issues of the Enlightenment, principally the relation between Europe and the Orient, and the distinction between barbarism and civilization.

The book is made up of four chapters, each of which stands as an elegantly executed piece of work, while the sum of the purposefully related parts constitutes a brilliant and important contribution to intellectual history. The first chapter, with Voltaire's list of conquerors as an epigraph, comprehensively presents the histories of the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century on Tatar conquest, like the *Histoire générale de l'Empire du Mogol* by François Catrou or the *Histoire de Tamerlan* by Margat de Tilly. Tamerlane and Genghis Khan turn out to be admired men in the Orientalist erudition of the age, men more intimately known than before through access to Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Chinese sources. Minuti emphasizes the importance of Jesuit historians in the positive valuation of Tatar conquest, and demonstrates the relevance of the contemporary analogy between the Mongols and the Manchus, whose empire appeared ripe for Christian conversion in some excessively hopeful Jesuit prognostications.

The second chapter focuses on Montesquieu, and takes as its epigraph the passage from the *Persian Letters* in which the Tatars were ambivalently saluted as masters of the universe and the scourge of nations. Minuti discovers in the works of Montesquieu an important intellectual development, from earlier writings like the *Persian Letters*, the *Considerations on the Romans*, and the *Reflections* on universal monarchy—in which the Tatars and Huns appeared principally as agents of conquest, in the tradition of contemporary Orientalists—to the later elaborations of the *Spirit of the Laws*, in which Montesquieu offered an analysis of the Tatars in terms of political system and social organization. It was thus that the Tatars appeared as a major item on the agenda of the Enlightenment, in Book 17 on "How the laws of political servitude bear a relation to the nature of the climate," as Montesquieu pursued the distinction between "the slavery of Asia" and "the liberty of Europe." In Montesquieu's climatic calculus, the Tatars were conquerors because Tartary was cold ("cold as Iceland"), and cold because of its elevation ("a kind of flat mountain")— from which followed an absence of cities and cultivation, but also the warlike courage to conquer peoples who lived in hot climates (and "who are indolent, effeminate, and timorous"). Minuti argues that Montesquieu became entangled in the implications of his own classifications when he failed to follow through on the analogy between the Tatars as barbarians of northern Asia

and the Goths as barbarians of northern Europe, insisting "that the nations in the north of Europe conquered as freemen; the people in the north of Asia conquered as slaves." Montesquieu almost recognized his own inconsistency when he dubbed the Tatars "the most singular people on earth." Minuti underlines this phrase by taking it as the title of his chapter, and, indeed, the logic by which Montesquieu made the Tatars exceptional betrayed the instability of the binary construction that differentiates Europe and Asia in the *Spirit of the Laws*.

In the third chapter Minuti turns to Voltaire, with an epigraph from the *Essay on Manners* to the effect that the barbarians of Tartary did not merit the attention of history any more than wolves and tigers. Voltaire, says Minuti, was not inhibited like Montesquieu from following through on the analogy between barbarians in Europe and Asia. Voltaire's historical perspective was radically, but evenly, devastating, as he eliminated the barbarians, one and all, from the historian's agenda. Minuti identifies this "*atteggiamento liquidatorio voltairiano*" as the key to comprehending Voltaire on the Tatars: the philosopher historian as uncompromising liquidator. Voltaire turned his tigerlike philosophical ferocity not only on the Tatars but on those historians who wasted their erudition writing the history of such barbarians. Minuti's remarkable double achievement is, first, the rediscovery of a whole arena of eighteenth-century erudition, concerning the Tatars, and second, an analysis of Voltaire's assault upon that erudite tradition, taking the Tatars as a point of departure. The insight gained into Voltaire's whole historiography makes Minuti's contribution one of the most valuable of the Voltaire tricentennial year.

Using both the *Essay on Manners* and the *Russian Empire under Peter the Great*, Minuti analyzes the importance of the verb *mériter* for Voltaire's historiography, the selective principle by which the historian determined what merited the attention of history. Minuti draws attention to the "zoomorphic metaphors" that Voltaire employed to characterize nomadic barbarians, who appeared as "ferocious beasts" in general, analogous to wolves or tigers in particular; their taste for liberty was characterized as little more than an instinct for movement on the part of those who saw cities as prisons. Cities, in fact, appeared as the hallmark of civilization, and Minuti follows Voltaire through a comparative evaluation of Alexander the Great and Tamerlane, who was "quite inferior to the Macedonian in that he was born into a barbarian nation and destroyed many cities, like Genghis, without building even one." Interestingly, although in the *Philosophical Letters* of the 1730s Voltaire was equally dismissive of Alexander and Tamerlane both, listing them together as mere conquerors, in the *Essay on Manners* of the 1750s he was more ready to distinguish the relative merits of great men of war. Like Montesquieu, he apparently underwent some significant evolution over the decades in his approach to the Tatars. Voltaire deployed further distinctions among conquerors in contemplating the history of his own century, comparing Alexander and Peter I as builders of cities to "these Tatars who were never anything but destroyers." Minuti even cites a letter to Frederick the Great in 1773 in which Frederick was flatteringly compared to Genghis Khan and Tamerlane—"who conquered more lands than you, but devastated them." In fact, for all Voltaire's readiness to eliminate the Tatars from history, Tamerlane did receive a chapter of his own (chap. 88) in the *Essay on Manners*, and got credit for living as a model of enlightened theism. "He was neither a Moslem, nor of the sect of the grand lama, but he recognized only one God," wrote Voltaire. "There was no superstition, neither in him nor in his armies."

The chapter on Voltaire concludes with a coda on Buffon, whose racial ideas about the Tatars and negative evaluation of their "ugliness" in physiognomy, is treated in relation to Voltaire's negative verdict on their social organization. Minuti then moves on to the final

chapter, which makes another important contribution to the history of the Enlightenment by restoring merited attention to the figure of Joseph de Guignes, author of the *History of the Huns* in the 1750s. De Guignes, one of the pioneering scholars of eighteenth-century Orientalism, represented the tradition of erudition that Voltaire resented and rejected. In lavishing his erudition on the Huns, and publishing the work immediately after the *Essay on Manners*, de Guignes challenged Voltaire's principles of selection and liquidation. Thus the Tatars in the 1750s became a central issue in the academic combat between rival schools of historiography. Minuti takes as his epigraph the declaration of de Guignes that he could not accept the principle that barbarians were no more worthy than wolves or tigers to be the subjects of history. De Guignes has the last word in Minuti's fascinating account of the struggle between erudition and liquidation. In fact, Minuti argues for the existence of some intellectual accommodation by showing that the Oriental erudition of de Guignes was actually structured according to some of Voltaire's philosophical principles—which suggests that by the 1750s there already existed a certain consensus of the Enlightenment concerning the Tatars.

Minuti's own erudition is altogether admirable. The arguments are carefully constructed, and the documentation is thorough and extensive. The book is full of important insights that not only establish the rich significance of the Tatars as a subject of eighteenth-century French historiography, but also make a major contribution to the understanding of eighteenth-century Orientalism and the evolving idea of civilization. It should stimulate further work in the field, for Minuti touches upon a number of related subjects that lie just outside the focus of his own work: the Enlightenment's ancient history of the Scythians, its discovery of the contemporary Tatars in the Crimea and along the Volga, and the literary rather than strictly historical aspects of Orientalism touching upon the Tatars. Minuti's concerns culminate in the 1750s, but he suggests the importance of the Tatars on the agenda of the later Enlightenment. While there is much attention to the figure of Genghis Khan, there is rather less about Kublai Khan, though Minuti does mention that Kublai appears in de Guignes as a model of enlightened rule and an example of the civilized barbarian. Especially considering that *Oriente barbarico* was published in Venice, one might wonder how the Enlightenment's reading of Marco Polo influenced the eighteenth-century idea of the Tatars. Finally, Minuti's analysis of the Enlightenment and its Tatar preoccupations may serve as a warning against indifference and ignorance in the twentieth century, when the Tatars in the lands of the former Soviet Union may appear alien or remote from certain foreign perspectives, but are neither irrelevant nor insignificant for the concerns of contemporary history.

Larry Wolff
Boston College

LA LETTERATURA RUSSA DEL NOVECENTO. PROBLEMI DI POETICA. By *E. Etkind, G. Nivat, I. Serman,* and *V. Strada.* Naples: Istituto Suor Orsola Benincasa, 1990. 143 pp.

In the beautiful setting of the Suor Orsola Benincasa Institute in Naples, four eminent Slavists met on May 12, 1988, each delivering a paper on problems of poetics in twentieth-century Russian literature. Two years later, the papers were published in the present bilingual (Russian and Italian) collection.

Efim Etkind's article, "Edinstvo 'serebrianogo veka'" ("The Unity of the 'Silver Age'"), focuses on the structural element typical of artistic creation at the beginning of the twentieth century: its contradictory unity. It is contradictory, Etkind explains, because while contemporaries and close successors of the different "schools" see incompatible contrasts among them, posterity finds unity. In Etkind's words, the cyclical character of the literary process is once more confirmed at the beginning of the century by a "decadence" of prose and a "renaissance" of poetry. As prose disappears, so too do its "fellow-travelers": positivistic historicism and scientism, naturalistic theater, genre-painting, realistic opera, publicistic (populist) criticism. As poetry reappears, so too do its "satellites": religious philosophy, symbolist and lyrical-subjective theater, metaphysical and decorative painting (*Mir Iskusstva*), revived and transformed classical ballet, impressionistic and aesthetic criticism. The optimistic view of the previous age, Etkind continues, is replaced by a hopeless world which condemns human beings to loneliness, sorrow, madness, and death. Therefore the only way out is Art. Art becomes the new divinity, and its priests are the Poets. Etkind concludes his article by identifying the common features of the different trends in twentieth-century poetry: a reverence for poetry, a constant interest in the function and structure of poetical language, the search for the "materiality" of verse, and a new hierarchy of the arts—the Symbolists return to the Romantic idea of music as protoart, as the essence of the universe. The Acmeists discover architecture, while the Futurists prefer the figurative arts. Etkind's insightful analysis of the "Silver Age" clearly shows the common foundation which reunites the adversaries of yesterday: all of them are poets, all of them treat human beings outside their social milieu, all of them intensely meditate on the specificity of the poetic word.

Il'ia Serman's contribution to the collection, "Gor'kii v poiskakh geroia vremeni" ("Gor'kii in Search of the Hero of the Time"), analyses the writer's attempt at representing the spiritual atmosphere of the "Silver Age" in his last novel *Zhizn' Klima Samgina* (*The Life of Klim Samgin*). Serman believed that an unbiased look at Gor'kii's literary development permits the discovery of the author's persevering search for a great epic form. In connection with this, Serman observes Gor'kii's constant oscillation between two types of epic prose: the centripetal novel, based on a historical-cultural character, and the novel-chronicle, where the carrier of action and story is the flow of time. After a brief overview of Gor'kii's previous literary production, Serman concentrates on the novel *Zhizn' Klima Samgina*, which he sees as a turning point in the writer's career. Written in the last decade of his life, *Zhizn' Klima Samgina* is a novel about intellectuals, in which Gor'kii wishes to represent "how Russians lived, thought, and acted between the 1880s and 1919." In Serman's opinion, the novel's theme is free thought and its hero, Klim Samgin, is an intellectual, very much in the spirit of Dostoevskii's heroes, who lives and acts in his own time, thus having to deal with the new Bolshevik ideas. Yet his inner attitude is to meditate

on things and try to elevate himself above the masses by practicing self-reflection, and by searching and finding contradiction in everything.

The fact that Gor'kii discarded the novel's previous title, *Istoriia pustoi dushi* (*The Story of an Empty Soul*), because it suggested a centripetal novel, and Gor'kii's own definition of his work as "novel-chronicle," lead Serman to conclude that *Zhizn' Klima Samgina* belongs to the genre of the novel-chronicle. However, one could argue that *Zhizn' Klima Samgina* might as well be defined a centripetal novel, since it focuses on its main character.

In conclusion, Serman considers Gor'kii's last novel of great interest for the contemporary reader because many of the problems concerning the Russian intelligentsia at the beginning of the century still are a subject of debate in today's Russia.

Georges Nivat's paper, "Dva 'zerkal'nykh' romana tridtsatykh godov: *Dar* i *Master i Margarita*" ("Two 'Specular' Novels of the 1930s: *The Gift* and *The Master and Margarita*"), points to the interesting traits these two works have in common. Both novels were written in the 1930s and were censored. Their authors, Vladimir Nabokov and Mikhail Bulgakov, were subjected to tyranny. Both novels are self-referential works, i.e., reflection upon the destiny of the text is part of that text, at times even the most important part.

The novels present a "duplicity" or a "specular form" in the narrative. In both novels there is a text within the text: the *mise en abyme* of the first text into the second one is important for the structure and for the ideological content of the novels, and gives them a mysterious ambivalence. The center is a writer, a creator. The dialectical relationship among created object, creator, and the world around them, forms a triple interreacting structure which is the key to the true and the real. Both novels constitute a creative and narcissistic answer to the pain of being free creators in a reified world (decadence of the literary world.) The novels represent the ambiguous drama of creation: they are theater representations and a sort of *Passio*.

In both novels Russian literature functions as a referential field, as sense and salvation for the Russian people. They are *Künstlerromans*, the instrument of salvation in a *Künstlerroman* being the writing. The creator is the savior; he disarms evil and arms the Word, who saves the heroes from death by exile in *Dar,* and from death by cowardice in *Master i Margarita.* Although original and captivating, Nivat's contribution sometimes reads more like a preparatory draft, due to its sketchy exposition. Perhaps this published essay is a shorter version of a more complete article.

Vittorio Strada's article, "*Doktor Zhivago* kak istoricheskii roman" ("*Doctor Zhivago* as a Historical Novel"), suggests a new, stimulating reading of this work. Strada points to two kinds of prose in Pasternak's previous literary activity: narrative prose or protofiction (*Devstvo Liuversa*), and autobiographic, essay prose (*Okhrannaia gramota*). In both cases the underlying element is poetry. Strada also observes two levels of writing: directly poetic (poetry) and indirectly poetic (prose). With *Doctor Zhivago,* Pasternak experiments with a new form of prose: the novel is, in the writer's own words, a letter to his friends, a duty towards those who love him. Therefore *Doctor Zhivago* is a testament, the fruit of a great experience and of a free meditation, the product of a healthy crisis, a creative revision of Pasternak's past ideas on culture and art. According to Strada, Pasternak and his hero Zhivago cannot accept an abstract and merciless rationalism, which plans the organization of life by coercing a free force otherwise ignored. At first Zhivago is enthusiastic about the revolution, which he senses as an act of liberation, but soon he understands that revolution is an event not of freedom but of serfdom, not of emancipation but of massification, not of brotherhood but of hatred. In Strada's analysis *Doctor Zhivago* is a *Bildungsroman*, a novel of education, but of negative education, unrelentingly vowed to death. It is also a lyrical-

historical novel of education. The lyrical element permeates the whole novel, while history is the horizon of Zhivago's education towards loneliness and death. History for Pasternak is a movement of cosmic time which has its center in Christ; it is the affirmation of the values of individuality and freedom, which both pagan and Hebrew antiquities ignored.

At the end of his article Strada brings in two works which have often been compared with *Doctor Zhivago*. The first one, the novel *Zhizn' Klima Samgina* by Gor'kii, constitutes a sort of negative background to Pasternak's novel: the essence of Russian spiritual history of that time is centered in the vital fullness of Zhivago and not in the ghostly void of Klim Samgin. The second novel, Tolstoi's *War and Peace*, seems to have many points in common with *Doctor Zhivago*. In the latter, however, war is replaced by revolution and the concept of History is differently stated. Also different is the notion of Christianity, seen by Pasternak as the moment of mediation between Lyric, or subjectivity, and History, or objectivity. Strada concludes his masterful article affirming that *Doctor Zhivago* is a lyrical-historical novel of education, a "letter" to the people who love its author and are able to receive his great testament.

Maria Federica Lamperini
Harvard University

NAME, HERO, ICON: SEMIOTICS OF NATIONALISM THROUGH HEROIC BIOGRAPHY. By *Anna Makolkin*. Approaches to Semiotics, 105. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992. xvi, 264 pp.

Had Anna Makolkin's astonishingly obtuse but self-important "semiotic study" of biographies of Taras Ševčenko been published by a vanity press, one would be inclined to ignore it. It being the case, however, that *Name, Hero, Icon* has the imprimatur of the editorial board of one of the most respected concerns in Slavic publishing and in its acknowledgments enumerates several eminent scholars as well as a copy editor and proofreader, its appearance cannot go unremarked. Indeed, the latter two—out of incompetence or a sense of futility?—have contributed to the production of a book as editorially sloppy as it is intellectually lame. Sentences such as, "The subject's past transcends the chronological barriers and is transformed into a timeless winter scene which share simultaneously all the participants of the biographical discourse" (p. 124; this and all subsequent citations from Makolkin's book, including punctuation, *sic*), abound; the (mis)use of articles is straight out of a Soviet English-language translation from the mid-fifties; Чалий appears as either "Chaly" or "Chalyi" not only throughout the book, but on the same page (p. 201); Репнін(а) appears as "Renina" here (p. 81) and "Repin" there (p. 117, twice!); the "onomastic" root Григор- is bizarrely transliterated (throughout) as "Hrygor-" and Енг/ґельгардт as "Enhelgardt" (p. 121) (which, I suppose, is at least consistent with Makolkin's somewhat cryptic admonition in her "Note on Translation and Transliteration" that "very few cases of transliteration followed accepted types" [p. xv]); etc., etc., etc. (The inclusion of a name index would only have compounded, I am sure, this sad comedy of errors; instead, the reader is treated to a "scientific" [this is, after all, a "study" in "semiotics"], probably

computer-generated subject index that contains such useful entries as "beauty," "hatred," and "literary.")

But to be fair, even an accomplished editor would be at a loss with a manuscript containing passages such as this (and I am literally choosing at random):

> Biographical discourse is notionally non-fictional, but it may extend its narrative territory at the expense of fictionalizing the Real, be it real facts, or real names and places. The device of **name delaying** is one way of representing the biographical reality in a desirable fashion. Name delaying . . . may be employed with the help of **name-substitutes** or implied names. The **pronomial pause** or delay in naming through substituting a personal pronoun, is another device frequently used by biographers when the heroic name is still in the process of making. The personal pronoun "he" or "she" is the traditional way of naming the undesirable or yet unpopular hero. Biographers use it extensively when they have to present some controversial facts or place the biographical subject in an unexpected context. They would rather speak about a mythical, mysterious or anonymous person instead of the concrete hero known to their readers. By referring to the poet as "he," the biographer does not have to repeat the name with the obviously ukrainian ending "Ko" that would have sounded non-Russian and striking next to the title "Russian hero" [p. 29, discussing V. Maslov's 1874 *Taras Grigorievič Ševčenko*];

or, discussing "Sergii Efremov"'s 1914 biography of the poet:

> Efremov adds that the right-bank Ukraine produced the hero, stressing that his subject is a former serf from the Eastern Ukraine. The biographer delineates the frontier between Eastern and Western Ukraine:
>
> То були знов же мало не одним лицем люде з лівобережноі Украини, де національні стосунки не так тяжко поплутались,—він був з правого боку Дніпра, де соціяльна безодня між паном та кріпаком ще глибше позначилась через національну та релігійну ріжницю між паном-поляком католиком і кріпаком-українцем-православним....(7)
>
> Efremov semiotically divides one national group that produced various intellectuals. He rightly or wrongly claims that Shevchenko has a special heroic status among them as not only a product of Eastern Ukraine, but of Eastern Orthodoxy as well. The Western Ukraine has been traditionally associated with presumably more progressive foreign influence in the cultural and religious domain, and Efremov capitalizes on prevalent mythical beliefs which may appeal to certain Ukrainian cultural groups among both the elite and the populace. The myth of the progressive "Other," Slavs versus the West, has had a traditional popularity among those groups. The biographer uses it for the purpose of transferring the familiar myth to another mythical territory, the myth of the national genius [pp. 64–65].

Appearances to the contrary, these passages were written, as far as I could determine, in all earnestness. In any case, they speak (or rather, prate) for themselves and should suffice as a warning to anyone tempted to reach for *Name, Hero, Icon* while searching for (sorely needed) studies of the reception of Ševčenko or, on a broader theoretical level, for new approaches to the study of literary biography. At the same time they only underscore the danger of theory, but particularly semiotics, when utilized as a shortcut to, and in some instances a simulacrum for, scholarship: in Makolkin's hands "concepts" such as "'Other,'" "desire," "myth," "discourse," indeed, "semiotics" (fatuous diagrams included), are little more than "signifiers" in the "discourse" of a parrot.

Roman Koropeckyj
University of California, Los Angeles

MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANITY IN UKRAINE (988–1988). Edited by *Oleh W. Gerus* and *Alexander Baran*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada, 1989. xii, 302 pp.

ZBIRNYK TYSIACHOLITTIA KHRYSTYIANSTVA V UKRAÏNI (988–1988). Edited by *Oleksander Baran* and *Oleh W. Gerus*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Ukraïns'ka vil'na akademiia nauk v Kanadi, 1991. xiii, 282 pp.

As part of the worldwide observance of the millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, members of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada presented a number of papers at conferences and colloquia sponsored by the Academy. These two volumes consist mainly of such papers (in English and Ukrainian respectively). Both volumes begin with a general introduction by the editors in which they deal with the reasons for the acceptance of Christianity and its impact on the historical and cultural development of the Ukrainians.

The English collection consists of sixteen papers by such scholars as Petro B. T. Bilaniuk, Alexander Baran, Oleh W. Gerus, Roman Serbyn, George D. Knysh, Jaroslav Rozumnyj, and others. The authors, with some exceptions, are all well known as professors at various Canadian universities in such fields as theology, history, political science, and Slavic studies. The Ukrainian collection contains fourteen papers. The contents of these two volumes are not identical, although some of the same contributors appear in both.

Papers in the English volume deal with a variety of questions; the emphasis, however, is on the medieval and early modern periods of Ukrainian history. Thus, Bilaniuk discusses the contribution of the Scythian monks to the Christian West. Knysh advances an interesting hypothesis concerning St. Gorazd's (a disciple of St. Methodius) missionary work in Ukraine. Baran dwells on the Church-state ideology of Ilarion of Kiev (the first metropolitan born in Rus'). Serbyn challenges the generally accepted hypothesis regarding the unity of Rus'. Rozumnyj presents onomastic insights into the well-known *Lexicon* of Pamva Berynda (an important linguist in the Ukrainian baroque tradition). Roman Yereniuk examines one of the means by which Ukrainian ecclesiastical autonomy was curtailed and then abolished by the Russians, using as an example the independent printing activities of the Kievan Metropolitanate after its annexation to the Moscow Patriarchate (1686–1763). Gerus deals with a more contemporary subject, namely the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada, focusing his attention on Metropolitan Ilarion (Ivan Ohienko, a well-known Slavist).

Papers in the Ukrainian volume are divided into three sections: history, literature, and the fine arts. In the historical section there are several studies, not all of which were written specifically for this collection. The papers in this volume also deal with a variety of questions. For example, Knysh analyses different hypotheses regarding the origin of Kievan Rus', and Baran, in one paper, deals with the reasons for the acceptance of Byzantine Christianity by Volodymyr the Great and, in another, with the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Canada. The literary section is composed of five studies: two on Taras Shevchenko (by

Rozumnyj and Magdalena Lászlő-Kuțiuk), two on Ukrainian expressionism (by Oleksandra Chernenko and Halyna Muchina), and one on Ukrainian-Canadian poetry (by Wolodymyr T. Zyla). The fine arts section contains two articles on church architecture, one by Bohdan Stebelsky and one by the artist Roman Kowal.

Taken as a whole, these two volumes of papers present an interesting array of subjects, questions, and approaches pertaining to the general theme of the millennium of Christianity in Ukraine. While not all contributions are of the same scholarly value, they do, nonetheless, make for engaging and profitable reading. They show that the study of the interplay between faith and culture is, indeed, an enriching and ever-gratifying experience. They are a valuable addition to the literature—both in English and in Ukrainian—on the meaning of Christianity and its influence on the shaping of Ukrainian cultural and political identity. They will certainly benefit not only the general reader, but also the specialist, who will find in them a number of new and valuable insights.

Oleh A. Krawchenko
St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg
University of Manitoba

CHURCH, NATION AND STATE IN RUSSIA AND UKRAINE.

Edited by *Geoffrey A. Hosking*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991. xv, 357 pp. ISBN 0-920862-71-3. $59.95.

Geoffrey A. Hosking has brought together a group of religious experts to examine Church-state relations and religion in general in Russia and Ukraine at the time of the millennium celebration of the Christianization of the East Slavs. After a brief introduction by Hosking, the book takes off on an interesting, if eclectic journey through the annals of religious history in Ukraine and Russia from the sixteenth century to the present.

Frank Sysyn analyzes Ukrainian religious culture in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and believes that this period, which saw a mingling of Eastern and Western Christianity in Ukraine, shaped Ukrainian religious history. Robert Crummey examines the ascetic life developed by the Vyg fathers in the eighteenth century as they tried to escape the growing absolutism of Moscow. Stephen Batalden describes the problems, especially the printing of the Bible, that evangelicals experienced in the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century. Franklin Walker shows how the revolutionaries of the nineteenth century assimilated partly the Christian ethic of service and social justice. Brenda Meehan-Waters studies the role of the *staritsy*—holy women ascetics—of the nineteenth century. David Collins describes the practical piety of Orthodox missionaries, despite religious ennui. Paul Valliere documents the isolation of the church leadership and its inability to lead a religious revival in imperial Russia. Pål Kolstø examines the influence of Orthodoxy on Lev Tolstoi and his opposition to organized religion. Simon Dixon shows that, despite Orthodoxy's earned reputation for detachment from human need, there were some clerics

in the nineteenth century who tried to address social injustice. John-Paul Himka outlines the history of the Greek Catholic Church of Galicia in the nineteenth century.

The inability of the Orthodox religion to reform itself led to tension with Old Catholics, as John Basil relates, and in Orthodox seminaries and schools, as explained by John Morison. Michael Meerson examines the political outlook of the Orthodox leadership in the Soviet period, and Philip Walters covers the schism of the 1920s. Dimitry Pospielovsky reviews the Soviet persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church, and Bohdan Bociurkiw chronicles the emergence of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church between 1919 and 1922. Raymond Oppenheim provides a convincing case that the so-called Furov Report, which describes the Council for Religious Affairs policies towards Orthodoxy, is genuine. Peter J. S. Duncan examines the tie between Orthodoxy and Russian nationalism and John Dunlop reviews religious themes in current Soviet literature and film.

As with many books of essays, there is a broad range in the quality of the contributions. This book is no exception. In general, all the essays present solid and interesting information. They also have a number of common themes: religion is at the base of the Russian and Ukrainian nations; and Church-state relations among the East Slavic peoples have been difficult and plagued with misunderstanding, manipulation, ideology, and power politics.

The book is, of course, dated, since it misses the dynamic role that religion is playing in Ukraine and Russia today in the wake of the breakup of the Soviet Union. The Ukrainian Catholic Church has been legalized and Solzhenitsyn is building a home in Russia. There is need for another volume to analyze the role of religion in Ukraine and Russia now.

Dennis J. Dunn
Southwest Texas State University

"NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH": A HISTORY OF THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT IN RUSSIA, 1875–1922. By *Maria Carlson*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993. ix, 298 pp.

Arcane as the title might appear, this volume addresses an important, unduly neglected sphere of Russian cultural history in late imperial Russia. As the author vigorously and convincingly argues, the occult in general and theosophy in particular were of considerable importance, especially for the creative intelligentsia. As the case studies of Nikolai Roerich and Andrei Belyi demonstrate, their work is only comprehensible if one understands the theosophical movement that deeply influenced their work.

The monograph is an extraordinary, impressive piece of research. After first providing a brief background to the occult movements, it examines the origins and early development of theosophy, which first came to prominence under the influence of a Russian woman, Helena Petrovna Blavatsky. The author provides a fascinating account of her activities, scandals, and waxing popularity inside Russia itself. Although Mme. Blavatsky's behavior did bring some disgrace on the movement, it nonetheless continued to grow and develop after the turn of the century with deep ties to the International Theosophical Society and

newer currents (especially Rudolf Steiner's anthroposophy). The volume provides a clear and systematic description of the various branches of the Russian Theosophical Society, not only its main center in St. Petersburg, but also some provincial organizations (each with its own unique proclivity). It next turns to a systematic explication of theosophy—its main propositions and corresponding critiques. The volume traces the story after 1917, first its suppression inside Bolshevik Russia and then its continued existence abroad. It includes a valuable glossary of "theosophical vocabulary" as well as a full list of all theosophical publications inside Russia from 1881 to 1918.

The result is a judicious, scholarly account of theosophy, its main leaders and organization, and clear indications of its broader impact on contemporary society and especially intelligentsia culture. The research itself is quite impressive, all the more since Soviet libraries systematically excluded such literature from their regular inventories. Given the lack of archive access (only a single archive file was directly consulted) and the contradictory evidence in the printed sources, the reader can only marvel at the author's meticulous and sensible effort to separate fact from fiction.

So pioneering a work cannot fail to raise some criticisms, however. First, the author does not successfully explain the sociology of the movement; without a clearer awareness of the social structure and change in late imperial Russia, vague references to "educated middle classes" (p. 29) and awkward listing of social categories (p. 62) do not indicate which social groups proved particularly responsive. Second, however powerful an influence theosophy may have exercised on specific figures in the intelligentsia, it is not entirely clear that theosophy had much broader import for the intelligentsia and educated public. To be sure, the publication of thirty journals and eight hundred titles between 1881 and 1918 does suggest broader interest. Still, this was an age of exploding publications; only a comparison with the other press runs and absolute number of titles would indicate whether theosophy had any significance in an explosively growing cultural marketplace. Third, the work makes some minor errors of fact (e.g., referring wrongly to Grigorii Rasputin as a "monk," pp. 7 and 37) and might have drawn more amply on literature about the Russian women's movement (given the disproportionate role of women in the Theosophical Society). Fourth, the author makes some use of the Orthodox commentaries on theosophy, but might have drawn more extensively on the huge (if unwieldy) ecclesiastical press. Finally, now that the Russian libraries and especially archives pose few restrictions, it will be possible for a future researcher to tap many important materials—in ecclesiastical archives (e.g., the Holy Synod in Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoričeskii arkhiv, fond 796) and personal archives (e.g., the files of Anna Pavlovna Filosofova, ibid., fond 1075).

As it stands, however, this is a first-class study that should be read by all students of late imperial Russia, especially those interested in cultural and intellectual history.

Gregory L. Freeze
Brandeis University

THE PRIMACY OF PETER: ESSAYS IN ECCLESIOLOGY AND THE EARLY CHURCH. Edited by *John Meyendorff.* Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992. 182 pp.

Shortly before he died, John Meyendorff published the second edition of an English translation of a work he had edited in French, *La primauté de Pierre dans l'Église Orthodoxe* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1960). The French original had already been translated into English as early as 1963. The contributors to the first edition, besides Meyendorff himself, were Nicholas Koulomzine, professor of New Testament at the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris; Nicholas Afanas'ev, professor of canon law and Church history at the same Institute, who died in 1966; and Alexander Schmemann, dean at St. Vladimir's, who died in 1983. The second edition contains a new article, that of Veselin Kesich, professor emeritus of New Testament at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary. These Orthodox theologians set themselves the task of understanding the primacy of Peter. As Paul VI put it, the Petrine office, meant to be a service to the union of the Church, actually forms the main stumbling block on the way to reunion. The editor adds, however, that this does not hold true of the Roman primacy of the early centuries, but only of its present form (p. 9).

Hailed as a milestone on the way toward rapprochement when it first appeared, the publication is of such an importance that its contents deserve to be briefly sketched, especially since far from losing their relevance, they are more than ever needed in the current debate.

In his "Peter's Place in the Primitive Church," N. Koulomzine seeks to understand Peter's position in the context of the time and place in which it developed (p. 14). This was the Jerusalem community and the roles assumed by various members of the Twelve. He points out that no successor to James was elected after his martyrdom to fill in the *collegium* of Twelve (p. 20), which indicates a new trend after the choice of Matthias to replace Judas. To these two trends or phases themselves there correspond two different roles of Peter, followed by a third, when he left Jerusalem. Peter does not seem to have had a permanent seat but rather a peripatetic mission (p. 23). His primacy appears to have been tied to a particular role which changed once he left Jerusalem and became a roving apostle (p. 33). Not only did he exercise his primacy in conjunction with the Twelve, but only so long as he stayed in Jerusalem; afterwards, the Twelve as a *collegium* ceased to function.

V. Kesich treats an overlapping theme, "Peter's Primacy in the New Testament and the Early Tradition." He rephrases the question to mean how the New Testament and Christian authors of the second and third centuries understood the role of Peter (p. 35). Kesich shows sensibility to developments in exegesis, adopting (at least as working hypotheses) widely accepted conclusions from *Redaktionsgeschichte* (p. 36). He is thus in favor of removing Christ's promise in Mt. 16:17–19 from its present context to the post-Resurrection period, a relocation which, far from weakening the claim of the Roman primacy, may actually strengthen it (pp. 46–47). Still, it was not Peter who appointed a successor to Judas in the apostolic college. Irenaeus and Eusebius distinguish between the Apostles and the bishops that followed them (p. 56). At the Jerusalem council it is James who, by pronouncing his "I decide," behaves in a fashion far more papal than either Peter or Paul does (Acts 15:19); and, on the basis of Mt. 16:17-19, a particular Church with a better claim on the primacy than Rome would be Antioch (p. 59). So Christ's promise refers to Jerusalem when Peter was the head of its community (ibid.). The first bishop of Rome to use the passage as a proof

of the primacy was Callistus I in the early third century, whereas Tertullian opposes its exclusive reference to the bishop of Rome. In his controversy with Pope Stephen, Cyprian modifies his earlier interpretation and explains that the Church is built on one body, the corporate body of bishops (pp. 63–64).

But Kesich does not discuss (any more than does Koulomzine) the value of Peter's two epistles as an index of a continuing Petrine office in the New Testament itself. The case would possibly be enhanced if, especially with traditional Protestant criticism, one doubted Peter's authorship. Koulomzine only informs us that 1 Pet. 5:13 is the sole NT indication of Peter's presence in Rome, whence he sent his epistle (p. 22).

In his "St. Peter in Byzantine Theology" J. Meyendorff says that the rigid conservatism of Orthodoxy, by means of which she repeated faithfully the views of the Greek Fathers, prevented her from noticing the changes that had occurred in the exercise of that primacy in the West. For Origen all believers are Peter's successors, just as for Cyprian of Carthage every local Church is the see of Peter (pp. 69–70). All Byzantine authors consider Peter "*the* coryphaeus" of the Apostles, a title bound to Peter's confession. On the contrary, the polemicists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries interpreted the primacies of both Rome and Constantinople to be of imperial, rather than of divine, origin. Therefore, the first reaction of the East to the doctrine of primacy in the West was not to deny Peter's primacy but to reinterpret it in terms of their different ecclesiology (p. 83). Only as a result of the Fourth Crusade and Innocent III's efforts to latinize the East did a more vigorous polemic start, especially in the thirteenth century (pp. 76–77). Of the theologians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it is Symeon of Thessalonica who strikes the most interesting chord, because he assigns Rome her old place so long as she gives up her error (p. 86).

It is interesting, however, that Meyendorff does not discuss the evidence of the Byzantine liturgy (e.g., the long fast prior to the feast of SS. Peter and Paul), nor contrary examples (e.g., the "Pope acclamations" in the Councils, part of the Byzantine theological heritage).

The central piece is doubtlessly formed by one of Meyendorff's inspiring masters at St. Serge, N. Afanas'ev, whose article, "The Church Which Presides in Love," in many ways is a summary of his whole theology. Afanas'ev wants to abandon the traditional Orthodox approach to primacy, which was dependent on Roman Catholic theology, since its purpose was to refute the latter's claims. For this reason Afanas'ev starts out by discussing the notion of the primacy in general, and not simply that of the Roman Church. He approaches the problem not as an isolated theme, but rather from a comprehensive ecclesiological viewpoint. Indeed, he reduces ecclesiologies to two fundamental types: universal and eucharistic (p. 92). Universal ecclesiology, whose principles have been formulated by Cyprian, is typical not only of the Catholic Church, but also of the Orthodox Church. "Obviously, Orthodox theology has made Cyprian's doctrine her own (in part at least)" (p. 100). Again, the idea of councils, far from being opposed to primacy, in fact presupposes it (p. 101). On the basis of this premise Afanas'ev reaches the conclusion that, since there is no pan-Orthodox head of the Church, it is practically impossible to convoke a pan-Orthodox council (p. 102). The expression *primus inter pares* (first among equals) used for the patriarch of Constantinople he considers misleading.

The fullness of the Church is found where the Eucharist is. The one who celebrated the Eucharist on the day of Pentecost was Peter (p. 111). For this type of ecclesiology, it is not power or honor which is at the base of authority but love (p. 114). Eucharistic ecclesiology excludes primacy, but does not exclude the idea of a Church-in-priority. Whereas primacy belongs to one of the bishops, priority belongs to a local Church. To speak of "primacy" is

to put in legalistic terms what "priority" expresses in witness value (p. 115). For St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, and Tertullian, the idea of a universal Church simply did not exist. Even if Peter's position may be defined as being head of the Church of Jerusalem, Afanas'ev adds that for a time this was the only Church (p. 118).

But if we take the eucharistic ecclesiology for our starting point, it will be necessary to ask which local Church, if any one at all, had the priority in that period. The Church of Jerusalem behaved as such a Church: now, had the primacy belonged to a person, James would have passed it on to his successors (p. 123). The term "agape" in Ignatius' famous phrase, "The Church which presides in love," *prokathemene tes agapes*, means "the local Church in its eucharistic aspect" (p. 126). The author thus concludes that we should abandon the currently predominant universal ecclesiology and return to the eucharistic vision of the early Church (pp. 140–42). In spite of the immense influence he has exercised, both on Vatican II (see *Lumen Gentium* 3, 7, 11) as well as on current dialogue, Afanas'ev would have greatly abetted his case had he proceeded to develop an all-inclusive dogmatic systematics based on the Eucharist, and not given the impression that everything is reduced to the Eucharist.

The last contribution, "The Idea of Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology," comes from another disciple of Afanas'ev's, Alexander Schmemann. He sees the problem as lying in the lack of a clearly defined doctrine of the nature and functions of primacy (pp. 146–47). For this reason he defines primacy as an ecclesiastical power superior to that of a bishop, whose jurisdiction is limited to his own diocese (p. 145). He takes up the preliminary question of whether there is a power superior to that of the bishop, to which he, following Afanas'ev, answers with an unqualified "no" (pp. 147–48). While Orthodoxy extols the Church as an organic unity, canonical tradition in it has fossilized into canon law, as it has lost its vital link to ecclesiology (p. 149). Moreover, he rejects both the kind of universal ecclesiology that sees in the pope the universal head of the Church and the one which replaces him by its invisible head, Christ (pp. 150–51). The link existing between the eucharist and ecclesiology is signaled by the fact that every rubric has an ecclesiological meaning (p. 153). In fact, never was there such a living sense of *koinonia* as during the short period in which eucharistic ecclesiology triumphed (p. 158). For unity is not a matter of submission of one local Church to another, but of inter-Church witness (pp. 157–58).

Orthodoxy opposed to the idea of a personal supremacy the theory of a collective supreme authority. When merged with the Slavophile teaching of *sobornost'*, this enabled the Orthodox to accuse Catholics of having an over-juridical ecclesiology (pp. 158f.). But the synod as the supreme governing power of the Church corresponds neither to the Slavophile doctrine of *sobornost'* nor to the original purpose of synods, which is not power but witness in identifying all Churches as the Church of God (p. 159). This makes it necessary to have recourse to the synod in order to consecrate a bishop (p. 160). Schmemann stresses that for a long time local primacy was understood as the basic aspect of primacy (p. 161). However, some Orthodox canonists have wrongly rejected a universal primacy in the past or the need for it in the present (p. 163). For him, Rome's error consists rather in identifying her primacy with supreme power (ibid.). Unfortunately, a genuinely Orthodox evaluation of primacy in the first millennium, beyond apology and polemics, is still lacking. But this much may be said about it: its purpose was *sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum,* concern for all the Churches (p. 164). Insofar as primacy is power, it is not different from that of the bishop, whereas the primacy in question is really a function of the whole Church (p. 165). Schmemann does not hesitate to call the Byzantine period of history, with its mystique of the *symphonia,* "the beginning of an ecclesiological disease" (p. 169).

The ecumenical value of this collection of essays is all the more remarkable when one thinks that they were mainly written thirty years ago. Anybody who reads these essays is likely to be struck by the sustained effort to abandon past polemics and carry on a constructive dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church. The articles are singularly devoid of the triumphalistic language with which such problems were previously tackled, and, by and large, they are accompanied by a good measure of self-criticism. For example, Afanas'ev corrects Khomiakov's caricature of Orthodoxy as representing the union of faith in love. "Unity of faith still reigns within the Orthodox Church, but without union in love" (p. 143). Nor does the value of the book become lost in a memorable attempt, in itself highly commendable, to open oneself to the others. The question which the whole endeavor raises in view of the exercise of the primacy is a vital question for Catholicism. To it this volume has given a refreshing example of truth-searching and calls for an equally honest examination of the issue on the part of Catholic scholars themselves.

Naturally, in view of so much dialogue that has taken place in the meantime, one could have expected a review article outlining the changes from 1960 to now or at least some short bibliographical reference to recent studies of the primacy. To cite but two contributions which are nowhere mentioned: on the Orthodox side there is C. Patelos, *Vatican I et les évêques uniates* (Louvain, 1981), and, on the Catholic side, J. Spiteris, *La Critica Bizantina del Primato Romano nel secolo XII* (Rome, 1979).

Again, one cannot but note the progress Orthodox exegesis has made, especially since the intensification of worldwide ecumenical contacts. The present work in an apt reflection of the Orthodox presence in France and the United States. And yet, one may regret that an essay on comprehensive hermeneutics is lacking, so that Scripture passages are sometimes seen in isolation from the whole of tradition, in which not only literary passages count but also symbolic gestures. Still, the questions such a piece of scholarship raises both hermeneutically and theologically deserve an answer. Prescinding from the doctrine itself, how biblical and patristic is the usual presentation of the primacy in Catholic terms? However far advanced scholarly patristic works may be in the Catholic world, popular Catholic piety has still to go a long way before it can catch up with the patristic tonality of Orthodoxy. Perhaps an essay on the basically sacramental understanding of office, shared by both Catholics and Orthodox and ultimately deriving from the Fathers, could create a link to eucharistic ecclesiology. Thus, the prayer of absolution in penance is infallible, so that discussion of infallibility may well take a sacramental approach.

More such efforts as the present collection of essays, and a serene discussion of their results, can greatly contribute to bring about clarity and consensus in other disputed areas that still divide East and West.

Edward G. Farrugia, SJ
Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome

PASSION AND RESURRECTION: THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SOVIET UKRAINE, 1939–1989. By Serge Keleher. L'viv: Stauropegion, 1993. 299 pp. + 18 illus.

This is admittedly not a scholarly book; it attempts "to explain who the Greek Catholics are, what happened to them in Ukraine during these years, how they have endured, and how we can help them" (p. 7). Completed in September 1990, the book is already dated, given a number of publications on the subject including this writer's "The Ukrainian Catholic Church in the USSR under Gorbachev" (*Problems of Communism*, November-December 1990). Based mostly on second-hand sources and oral information given to the author during his travels to Ukraine, Fr. Keleher's book offers a brief historical background on Ukrainian Greek Catholicism, a short chapter each on the Greek Catholic Church under the first Soviet and the Nazi occupations; two chapters on the suppression of the Church in Galicia and Transcarpathia respectively, with six subsequent chapters describing the Church in prison or underground, and four final chapters dealing with the resurfacing of the Church, its legalization, and repossession of its churches. Appended to the book are fifteen "Documents," including a useful translation of Articles of the 1596 Union of Brest, several petitions to the pope and the Kremlin asking for relegalization of the Church, the 1989 declaration of the Ukrainian Council for Religious Affairs about legalization of the Greek-Catholic "confession," the statement of the March 17, 1990 Synod of Greek Catholic Bishops, etc., but not the January 1990 Vatican-Moscow Patriarchate "Recommendations of the Normalization of Relations between the Orthodox and Catholics of Eastern Rite in Western Ukraine."

The author, an Irishman (Serge Keleher or Brian O'Céileachair), is a Mithrophoric Archimandrite in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church of Canada, as well as Research Fellow of the Chair of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Toronto and a staff researcher at Keston Research, Oxford.

For a specialist, Fr. Keleher's *Passion and Resurrection* has little to offer. It abounds in errors and omissions. Referring to statistics for the prewar Greek Catholic Church (p. 23), the author is apparently unaware of the precise statistical data on the three Galician eparchies appearing in their *shematyzmy* for 1938–39 (had he consulted this writer's publication "The Suppression of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in Postwar Soviet Union and Poland," in Dennis J. Dunn, ed., *Religion and Nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union* [Boulder, Colorado and London, 1987, table 6.1], he would have found the statistical tables extracted from these *shematyzmy* along with a number of other useful data).

Specific errors are as follows: Page 24: There were precisely 932 Greek Catholic nuns in Galicia in 1938, not "several thousand." Page 28: The USSR annexed in 1945 "Carpatho-Ukraine," not "Subcarpathia." Page 39: Khrushchev's hint to Norman Cousins during their December 1962 meeting that Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi's death "may have been somewhat accelerated" was meant to insinuate that Metropolitan Slipyj may have "poisoned" his predecessor; it was not a "spontaneous admission" giving "substance to the belief that the Communists murdered Metropolitan Andrew." Page 40: Metropolitan Slipyj's delegation to Moscow was received not by G. G. Karpov, but by I. Polianskii, Chairman of the Council for Affairs of Religious Cults, that dealt with the non-Orthodox denominations in the USSR (that error also appears in Metropolitan Slipyj's memoirs). The author is not aware of an interview with M. Odintsov in an early October 1989 issue of *Argumenty i fakty* and Odintsov's article in the August 1990 issue of *Nauka i religiia*, revealing hitherto secret

documents on the treatment of the Greek Catholic Church by the authorities and Stalin's mid-March 1945 order to liquidate the Church via its "reunion" with the Russian Orthodox Church. Pages 42–43: Patriarch Alexis' surname was Simanskii, not "Shymansky," and his 1945 "pastoral letter" to the Uniates (of doubtful authorship) was undated (judging by its contents it was written before the end of the war, not May 10, 1945). Pages 43–44: Fr. Keleher's explanation of Fr. Kostel'nyk's motives in assuming leadership of the "Initiative Group" is much too simple in the light of the documents pertaining to this period. Page 45: The July 1, 1945 protest letter to Moscow was signed, as we know now, by 61 priests and monks, not 300. It is not true that the "vast majority of Greek-Catholic priests did not sign their adherence to the 'Initiatory Group'" (ibid.)—the complete list of signatories published by Archbishop Makarii (Oksiiuk) in 1947 contains 1,106 names of priests and 5 deacons, i.e. about half of the clergy in Galicia at that time. Page 61: The author's undocumented figure of "approximately two thousand priests" imprisoned in the 1940s and early 1950s is much inflated—there were not that many Greek Catholic priests if one excludes "converts" to Orthodoxy in the territories annexed by the USSR in 1944–45. Page 62: Bishop Iosafat (Kotsylovs'kyi) died on September 21, not November 17, 1947, in Kiev (not in Siberia) and was buried there. Page 65: The Basilian monastery in Zhovkva was closed down by July 1946, not in 1950. Page 71: The postwar Moscow Patriarchate never had "about 20,000 parishes." According to the Council for Affairs of the ROC, on January 1, 1948, it had 14,329 churches and prayer houses in the entire USSR, excluding 282 Greek Catholic parishes forced into the Russian Church in the Transcarpathian oblast' in 1948–49. No new ROC parishes were registered by the government since 1949. The fictitious figure of 20,000 was merely used for external propaganda purposes by the Patriarchate. Page 72: There were only two (not three) theological academies in the ROC. Page 93: Bishop Iosafat (Fedoryk), OSBM, had no territorial jurisdiction, so he could not have been "succeeded" by Bishop Pavlo (Vasylyk) who, too, had no jurisdiction. Page 131: It was not resident Greek Catholics in Moscow who staged public manifestations for the legalization of the UGCC, but the rotating groups of the Greek Catholic priests, nuns, and faithful from Galicia. Page 161: The January 1990 Moscow-Vatican agreement ("Recommendations on the Normalization of Relations between the Orthodox and Catholics of Eastern Rite in Western Ukraine") was published in *Pravda Ukraïny* of February 6, 1990 and the author could have located the text in time for publication. Apart from stating that the Union of Brest was a failure and placing "Catholics of Eastern Rite" within the Roman Catholic Church (no mention of the Greek Catholic Church), it provided that "the establishment of a hierarchical structure of Eastern Catholics in Western Ukraine be the subject of contacts between our churches (i.e., the Vatican and the Moscow Patriarchate) in order to avoid giving the impression of opposing one hierarchy to another (i.e., future Eastern Catholic hierarchy to the Orthodox one)."

The last part of the book, dealing with the revival of the Church (1989–90), is more reliable than the earlier sections; it is enriched by some of the author's personal observations and information supplied to him by his contacts in the Church during his visits to Ukraine. Incredibly, though, Fr. Keleher ignores in his account of the Greek Catholic Church's "Resurrection" the emergence of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Galicia predating that of the UGCC, which came to represent the principal challenge to the Greek Catholics, rather than the already disintegrating Russian Orthodox Church in that part of Ukraine.

Bohdan R. Bociurkiw
Carleton University

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY: THE POLITICS OF NATIONAL CULTURE. By *Thomas M. Prymak.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987. xi, 332 pp. ISBN 0-8020-5737-3. $40.00 cloth.

This monograph by Thomas Prymak is the first English-language attempt to re-create the life and work of Mykhailo Hrushevsky (1866–1934), Ukraine's most eminent historian and the major leader of the Ukrainian cultural and political rebirth in the first part of the twentieth century. He was the first president of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1918. Taking into account the diversified activity of Hrushevsky who, along with Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko, was the most prominent, influential force in the creation of the "New Ukraine," the author's task was not easy.

In his introduction, Prymak underscores that his primary objective is "to outline the most significant events of Hrushevsky's public life, and to paint a picture of how he dealt with the cultural and political dilemma of his time" (Introduction, p. 6). He endeavors to develop this objective in the course of eleven chapters organized in chronological fashion, which reflect the distinct stages of Hrushevsky's life, in particular his public service in the political and cultural spheres. The work is based on Hrushevsky's own published work, as well as on numerous publications of the Ukrainian Historical Association, particularly those appearing in *Ukraïns'kyi Istoryk.*

The question here is how successful the author of this biographical study is in presenting an accurate account of the historian's significant and diversified activity. One shortcoming of his work is that it does not include sources from many of the archival materials and biographical works of Hrushevsky found in the archives of Ukraine in Kiev and L'viv (e.g., the Manuscript Fund of the Vernads'kyi Central Scientific Library of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine), because these were inaccessible to the author at the time of this research. The methodological approach could be somewhat stronger, particularly in the verification of sources used in historical methodology. Two of the most significant sources were omitted. The first is Hrushevsky's *Spohady* (*Memoirs*), published in Kiev in 1988–1989, which capture Hrushevsky's years as a student, as well as his activity as the head of the Ukrainian Central Rada. The other essential source, as yet unpublished, is Hrushevsky's *Shchodennyk* (*Diary*), covering the period 1904–1910, which is located in the Ukrainian state archives in Kiev (Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukraïny, fond 1237). Still another source is Hrushevsky's correspondence with, for example, his brother Oleksander, Volodymyr Antonovych, Serhii Iefremov, Symon Petliura, Dmytro Bahalii, and others, without which it is impossible to faithfully and adequately recount the multifaceted career of the historian and his profound influence on the cultural and national renaissance of Ukraine. It is precisely for this reason that today, Thomas Prymak's work is dated, requiring fundamental augmentation and revision. For the current English-language reader, this work can serve as an introduction to Hrushevsky's biography, with the understanding that its primary sources are insufficient. Thus, the monograph can be regarded more as a sketch of Hrushevsky's life work than as an exhaustive biography.

At this point, we would like to add several critical remarks on the methodology used, and comment on some of the author's interpretations of Hrushevsky, which need additional clarification and possible modification. For example, the author writes that due to Hrushevsky's disposition, his co-workers (colleagues) "fled his company" (p. 266). He includes Oleksandr Ohloblyn in this group. As a matter of fact, however, Professor Ohloblyn *never* worked directly for Mykhailo Hrushevsky.

Another of Prymak's assertions, that Hrushevsky was "generally indifferent to the advantages of legal concepts of national sovereignty" (p. 356), does not withstand criticism. It is sufficient to acquaint oneself with the text of the Constitution of the Ukrainian National Republic from 1918, which was coauthored by Hrushevsky, in order to reject this questionable hypothesis.

Another erroneous conclusion is the author's contention that Hrushevsky opposed the formation of a Ukrainian army as an "anti-militaristic ideologue of the national movement" (p. 178). Yet it is known that in 1917 there existed a Ukrainian military unit called the "Hrushevsky Regiment," and that Hrushevsky himself in his writings and speeches in 1917–1918 recognized the importance of a Ukrainian armed force as an integral part of the national revival and establishment of statehood.

On page 251, Prymak writes that Hrushevsky was arrested following his arrival in Moscow on 9 March 1931. The author neglects to mention the reason for the arrest. It should be noted that in fact Hrushevsky was arrested on 23 March, as the "head" of the "Ukrainian Nationalist Center," which was plotting the overthrow of the Soviet government.

The author should have included more in-depth analysis of Hrushevsky's fundamental historical concepts and his major historical works, especially because of their central role in the Ukrainian national revival of the twentieth century. Prymak should also have included a clarification and analysis of the historian's two central concepts, those of the "Old Ukraine" and the "New Ukraine," which are directly related to his political-ideological postulate.

Although this work has methodological shortcomings, the author should be commended for writing this biography, which is the first comprehensive English-language publication about one of the major founders of the New Ukraine, the greatest Ukrainian historian, and the first president of an independent Ukrainian democratic state in the twentieth century.

Lubomyr Wynar
Kent State University

NARYS ISTORIÏ "PROSVITY." Edited by *Ihor Mel'nyk.* Populiarna entsyklopediia "Prosvity," No. 1. L'viv, Cracow, and Paris: Prosvita, 1993. 232 pp. ISBN 5-7707-0643-0.

This unpretentious but attractively bound volume deals with an important though rather elusive topic, since Prosvita (The Enlightenment Society) played a unique role among Ukrainian educational institutions, and its past is inextricably intertwined with the history of the political awakening and the cultural and social development of the Galician Ukrainians. Founded in L'viv in 1868, it soon expanded the network of its branches, affiliates, libraries, and reading rooms throughout eastern Galicia and later made its influence felt in Dnieper Ukraine and in practically all countries where Ukrainian immigrants settled in compact masses. Prosvita also organized agricultural and commercial schools and courses, sponsored the creation of cooperatives and credit unions, and generally embraced with its activities most aspects of Ukrainian community life. Deeply rooted among the masses of the people, whom it tried to acquaint with the achievements of both Ukrainian and world culture through the dissemination of hundreds of volumes of its

popular and more sophisticated publications, Prosvita was able to survive the devastation of the First World War and the collapse of the Ukrainian liberation struggle. Before its suppression by the Soviet authorities in 1939, it counted 84 branches, approximately 3,000 libraries, and over 3,200 reading rooms, with some 360,000 members, or about twelve percent of the Ukrainian population of Galicia. Moreover, while its supporters and sympathizers did not prevail against the onslaught of the Soviet regime, they did endure. It was again Prosvita—at first using the name of the Shevchenko Society of the Ukrainian Language—that provided the moving force behind the intellectual and political revival in Western Ukraine during the declining years of the Gorbachev era, and included among its most dedicated members the future leaders of Rukh and other political groups and organizations which actively promoted the idea of Ukraine's independence.

It is hardly surprising that, in spite of Prosvita's singular significance, its history has not yet become the subject of any scholarly study. After all, the records of the society and other materials pertaining to its manifold activities have until recently remained classified and largely inaccessible to researchers. Even so, several popular historical surveys have dealt in some detail with Prosvita's origins and development, to mention only Mykhailo Lozyns'kyi's *Sorok lit diial'nosty "Prosvity"* (L'viv, 1908), Stepan Pers'kyi's (pseudonym of Stepan Shakh) *Populiarna istoriia tovarystva "Prosvity" u L'vovi* (L'viv, 1932; reprint, Winnipeg, 1968, with a supplement by Stepan Volynets' covering the years 1932–39), and Volodymyr Doroshenko's *"Prosvita," ïï zasnuvannia i pratsia* (Philadelphia, 1959).

As the very name of the series in which the present volume appeared indicates, its authors had no scholarly aspirations and only wished to provide a concise factual account of the history and activities of the society which, within a comparatively short period of time, succeeded in awakening the national consciousness of the Ukrainian population of Galicia and in profoundly influencing its image of the contemporary world. This is a history of an organization, not an organizational history: thus, Prosvita's structure and finances, internal routines and external contacts are of only marginal interest to the authors, though some of these problems (notably the constantly recurring financial crises) are occasionally discussed at considerable length. As might be expected, the volume represents to some extent a synthesis of previously published work, but it also utilizes a wealth of new sources, including newspapers, organizational reports, business records, and other documents. Although a certain lack of unity is almost unavoidable in a composite volume of this type, individual chapters are arranged chronologically and topically to provide a readable whole. In addition, the authors have wisely decided not to dwell unduly on Prosvita's rather intricate system of affiliates, which allowed it to function effectively without overburdening its central office in L'viv.

The book opens with an emotionally charged foreword by Roman Ivanychuk, a noted historical novelist and, since 1988, the head of the reconstituted Prosvita in L'viv. Written in a polemical tone, it provides a brief outline of Prosvita's history, stressing the ideological continuity between the society founded a century and a quarter ago and its modern successor. However, the analogy Ivanychuk draws between Prosvita and the revolutionary Greek society Phileke Hetaireia (p. 3) seems rather far-fetched, and even the comparison between Prosvita and Matice Česká (established in 1831) is less than convincing, since the latter association had its obvious counterpart in Halyts'ko-Rus'ka Matytsia (founded in 1848), whose origins are briefly discussed by Teofil' Komarynets' in his essay on the prehistory of the enlightenment movement in Ukraine. As Ihor Mel'nyk correctly observes in the chapter on the creation of Prosvita as a Ukrainian populist organization, a much closer

parallel can be drawn between Prosvita on the one hand, and Matice Lidu (founded in Prague in 1867) and some contemporary Polish cultural associations, on the other (p. 16).

Actually, five chapters of the book (three of them covering the history of Prosvita from its founding to 1939) have been authored by Alla Serediak; taken together, her contributions amount to almost three-quarters of the whole text of the volume exclusive of the appendices. She took full advantage of the opportunity to utilize the materials in the Central State Historical Archive and the manuscript division of the Stefanyk Library in L'viv. The result is a surprisingly full descriptive and analytical account of an institution which helped to mode the life of the Galician Ukrainians during one of the most critical periods of their history. There is, however, no mention of contemporary ideological and political currents which adversely affected Prosvita's work, especially during the interwar period. Thus, for example, no direct or incidental reference is made to the founding of the Skala reading rooms in the Stanyslaviv eparchy by Bishop Hryhorii Khomyshyn, which were placed under the control of the local Greek Catholic clergy in order to insulate their members from any undesirable (mostly nationalistic and radical) ideological influences and which seriously undercut the development of Prosvita in that area. The chapter on Prosvita's expansion outside Galicia is rather superficial and clearly falls short of doing justice to the cultural activities and achievements of Ukrainian immigrants on the American continent. On the other hand, D. O. Svidnyk's depiction of the dramatic developments of the late 1980s and early 1990s, which eventually led to the rebirth of Prosvita and the disintegration of the Soviet regime in Ukraine, is both informative and expressive.

One of the most useful parts of the book is Serediak's concise bibliographical essay, which brings together and systematizes a wealth of data about Prosvita'a publishing activities. Hundreds of titles issued under its auspices were subdivided into numerous series and comprised different types of publications. These ranged from calendars and popular brochures and treatises covering a wide spectrum of disciplines (history, literature, geography, sociology, economics, agriculture, etc.) to textbooks for elementary and secondary schools and critical editions of the works of Ukrainian classics in the well-known series "Rus'ka pys'mennist'" (later renamed "Ukrains'ke pys'menstvo"). Equally helpful is Serediak's collection of biographical sketches (122 entries), especially since some of the individuals listed there are now practically forgotten, and the names of many of them are omitted from Soviet Ukrainian encyclopedias. Still, this reviewer feels that there is little point in including in this otherwise useful compilation such writers as Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi or Taras Shevchenko, whose only connecting link to Prosvita was the fact that their works were issued and popularized in some of its series of publications. The value of the volume is further enhanced by its appendices, which comprise the statutes of the Prosvita society of 1913 and 1991, as well as several statistical and chronological tables. There is also an impressive bibliography of close to three hundred titles in four languages.

In all, in spite of some minor factual and typographical errors, this is a carefully prepared and competently written account of what arguably was the single most important and influential institution in modern Ukrainian history, which gave birth not only to a number of other educational, cultural, and economic organizations, but also to political parties and movements, thus truly becoming, in Roman Ivanychuk's words, "the mother of Ukrainian societies" (p. 7).

Bohdan Budurowycz
University of Toronto

SOVIET NATIONALITY POLICY, URBAN GROWTH, AND IDENTITY CHANGE IN THE UKRAINIAN SSR, 1923–1934. By *George O. Liber.* Soviet and East European Studies: 84. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. xvii, 183 pp. + maps, appendices, notes, bibliography, index. ISBN (cloth) 0-521-41391-5.

Although social scientists have long been interested in the relationship between modernization and national identity, until recently their attempts to investigate how this relationship developed within the Soviet context has been frustrated by the paucity of hard data available upon which they could base their research. Now, with the publication of George Liber's *Soviet Nationality Policy, Urban Growth, and Identity Change in the Ukrainian SSR, 1923–1934,* scholars finally have a detailed, thoroughly documented, and well reasoned study of how Soviet state-sponsored modernization helped shape nationalism and national identity within regions falling under Soviet rule. Although Soviet officials intended their modernization and nationality policies to create an international supraethnic proletariat, their policies may actually have had the opposite effect, supplying the necessary preconditions for the emergence of clearly defined, modern national identities.

In this study, Liber explores the emergence and implementation of Soviet affirmation action policies for ethnic Ukrainians during and immediately after the NEP period. He begins by analyzing the social and political origins of *korenizatsiia* (indigenization or nativization), the Soviet Union's first, and most pluralistic, nationality policy. This policy was intended to bolster support for the Communist Party and the Soviet Union in peripheral areas where they were identified with the ruling principles of the Russian monarchy.

In the short run, it was believed that *korenizatsiia* would encourage non-Russians to view Soviet rule as legitimate. In the long run, national differences would lose their significance as all united as proletarians. Instead, these policies had the unintended consequences of reaffirming a sense among non-Russians that they were colonized by the Russian-dominated Communist Party that ruled the Soviet Union. They encouraged further national differentiation, but failed to legitimate Soviet rule. Coming during the difficult years of the early 1930s, this dissent caused a crisis that led to extensive purges and, less directly, to the famine of 1932–33.

The book is divided into four parts. In the first part, Liber examines the birth of Ukrainization, a cluster of nationality policies initiated by Soviet leaders to promote the legitimacy of the new government and its representatives among the predominantly peasant population in the Ukrainian SSR. From the beginning, Party activists strongly disagreed over the place Ukrainian culture should assume in the development of socialism. While some activists believed that Russian culture was more progressive than, and should eventually supplant, Ukrainian culture, other activists argued that such beliefs bore traces of tsarist-sponsored Russian chauvinism and demonstrated that Russian culture was still dominated by antidemocratic tendencies.

Although this conflict was never fully resolved, the all-Union Party did eventually decide that, in light of continued opposition to the Communist Party and Soviet rule among Ukrainian peasants and other peripheral populations, Party cadres would have to learn to use the indigenous language in their work among the peasants. This, it was hoped, would render Ukrainization more palatable to peasants, create a link between the countryside and the city, and bring peasants to view their new government and its representatives as legitimate.

In the second part of his book, Liber discusses how the industrialization policies initiated by Soviet officials in the Ukrainian SSR shifted the social context within which they could carry out their nationality policies from the countryside to the city. By encouraging large numbers of peasants to migrate into cities for the first time, this shift, fueled in part by Soviet industrialization drives in the 1920s, transformed the ethnic composition of Ukraine's Russified cities. This had a number of unintended consequences. The recent migrants from the countryside, the new majority in Ukrainian cities, came to form an unassimilable mass that resisted urban culture, a culture which they perceived to be dominated by Russians and Russified Ukrainians. Moreover, in large part because of the Party's official policy of Ukrainization, the new Ukrainian migrants came to recognize that they had a vested interest in asserting their distinctive nationality. Finally, instead of shedding their old identities and embracing the roles designated for them by their new leaders, the recent migrants to Ukrainian cities—now the majority of the urban working class—came to view the Russians and Russified Ukrainians whom they outnumbered (but who still formed the majority among Party cadres) with suspicion, if not hostility.

In the third part, Liber discusses how the programs that emerged from Ukrainization led many Ukrainians to accept an autonomist orientation that enabled them to differentiate between Ukrainian national interests and those of the Soviet leadership. By the mid-thirties, consciousness of Ukrainian national identity was no longer limited to a small circle of elites, but had grown into a mass political phenomenon that claimed support from various influential strata of the population, including the Ukrainian SSR Party leadership.

In the final part, Liber examines how the center reacted to the unintended consequences of *korenizatsiia* in the Ukrainian SSR. Once Stalin and his allies became aware of the autonomist direction being pursued by Ukrainians, they came to view nationally conscious Ukrainians as internal enemies, and acted with speed to eliminate them. Fearful that Ukraine was developing into an increasingly differentiated, independent, modern nation, Stalin and his allies took measures, including a massive famine and purges of the republic's Party, to bring the Ukrainian population into line.

In recent years, scholars have interpreted the emergence and spread of nationalism and national identity in a variety of ways. Most of these interpretations draw upon a cluster of approaches that attempt to theorize what can be loosely called the process of modernization. Some of these interpretations stress that nationalism and national identity are a result of increasingly integrated communication networks, others see them as related to the rise of mass politics, and still others stress the need for community in an increasingly mobile, rootless world.

Liber's study invites us to draw a number of conclusions about how modernization may be related to the formation of a stable national identity in the Soviet context. To begin with, Liber suggests that modernization took a unique form in late imperial Russia. When late imperial Russia suppressed the politicization of linguistic differences and, more importantly, when it placed curbs on the pace and extent of industrialization, it created a social environment that proved inimicable to the formation of a modern Ukrainian consciousness. Nor did early Soviet programs, which encouraged large numbers of Ukrainian-speakers to migrate to the cites and transformed them into industrial workers, in and of themselves provide the social preconditions for the solidification and differentiation of a mass Ukrainian identity. Ironically, the primary precondition in Ukraine was supplied by the Communist Party and its cadres. They had hoped that, once Ukrainian peasants had come to view themselves as Ukrainians, they would easily transcend this stage of national identification and become conscious of their new identity as members of a supranational

proletariat. Instead, early Soviet nationality policies helped Ukrainians to clarify their identity and to define themselves in opposition to Russians, the harbingers of social processes towards which newly conscious Ukrainians felt great ambivalence.

Until now, very little empirically based work has existed which systematically analyzed how Soviet state-sponsored modernization shaped the contours of national identity for broad sectors of this population, or how political decisions gave a specific cultural form to modernization, patterning both Russian and non-Russian national identitites. Liber's study broadens our understanding of how the homogenizing policies implemented by Soviet officials in the Ukrainian SSR created a complex social landscape occupied by an increasingly heterogeneous population. It begs for further comparative work on how Soviet modernization campaigns influenced the other nationalities of the Soviet Union.

Liber's study also sheds light on the possible social and political consequences of Soviet modernization campaigns, and offers a wealth of invaluable tables which break down the urban population, labor unions, and Party membership of Ukraine by nationality, native language, and social origin over the course of this period. It analyzes a chapter in the history of Soviet nationality policies—how they evolved, were implemented, altered popular perceptions, and affected the way in which the USSR was governed. Liber's study will be of interest to historians and social scientists who study national identity formation both within and beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union, as well as those interested more specifically in the Soviet postrevolutionary period. It will also be of interest to students of Soviet state policies. And, of course, this book offers a thorough and thoughtful contribution to the changing field of Ukrainian studies.

Alexandra Hrycak
Chicago

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN SOVIET OFFICIALDOM: COMBATTING CORRUPTION IN THE POLITICAL ELITE, 1965–1990. By *William A. Clark*. Contemporary Soviet/Post-Soviet Politics. Armonk, N.Y., and London: M.E. Sharpe, 1993. xi, 242 pp.

One of the problems facing politicians in the postcommunist states of the former USSR in engineering a transition to democracy, and for outside observers in trying to understand the limits of that process, is the Soviet legacy. New political systems may indeed be emerging from the remains of the Soviet empire, but they are not doing so from scratch. Part of that legacy is corruption, and it may determine that countries like Ukraine evolve a political system more similar to the Third World than the First.

William Clark's book should be a welcome guide to some of the heavy baggage the successor states were saddled with for the journey to democracy, baggage that may well prevent any progress at all. It is about corruption in the final quarter-century of the Soviet Union's existence, its institutionalization, and its implications for the future. The author sets out in a most encouraging manner by promising to deal with the subject in a comparative perspective, by arguing convincingly for the conceptualization of corruption as a legal construct, and by proposing the thesis that corruption emerged from the weakness of the Soviet system as both a functional and dysfunctional feature. In the second chapter

he demonstrates that the proclivity of Soviet officialdom to corruption sprang from three sources: the Russian heritage, the rules of bureaucratic organization and behavior generally, and the characteristics of Soviet ideology, law and administrative practice. The empirical portion of the book is found in chapter three, where the author analyzes data on 855 cases of officials prosecuted in 1965–90 for various corrupt practices. The data were obtained from *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, which he admits is problematical owing to the unknown selection criteria of the original newspaper editors as well as of the translators. He observes that infractions of the rules for personal benefit were treated much more harshly than those for institutional gain. From his empirical study Clark's conclusion is that official corruption, although prosecuted in the Soviet courts, was tolerated as a substitute for the reform of a feeble economic system; it became a necessity to which the law itself had to be bent, this further weakening the state.

Chapter four of this book outlines the institutional history of the various structures that were put in place by the Soviet leadership from time to time to attempt to deal with or to control official corruption. It also discusses whistle-blowing as a general phenomenon and as manifested in the Soviet Union, as well as the use of the personnel weapon in the fight against corruption. A fifth chapter tackles the politics of corruption and of anticorruption campaigns. The familiar cases from the Brezhnev era and its aftermath are reviewed: Sergei Medunov, Nikolai Shchelokov, Semen Tsvigun, Boris ("The Gypsy") Buriatia, Yurii Sokolov (director of Gastronom No.1), Sharaf Rashidov and the Uzbek mafia. By this point, it becomes difficult to disentangle genuine corruption from corruption used as a stick to beat one's political opponents, which may be what Clark is getting at. The final chapter attempts to draw up a balance sheet of positive and negative impacts of corruption on the Soviet system, and concludes on the happy note that corruption was on the whole beneficial because it helped overcome the maldistribution of goods and services inherent in the command economy.

Although Clark's conclusion is consistent with his initial definition of corruption as "an extralegal system for the production and distribution of services" (p. 9), this—like the book as a whole—is not fully satisfactory. Surely the effect of official corruption on legitimacy must be considered, both on the Soviet political system as well as on its successors. This is not adequately addressed in the book under review, but needs to be. Considering the overly heavy reliance on secondary sources, however, that neglect may not be surprising, and specialists will be disappointed to find here very little that is new. If democracy includes the principle of the rule of law, as it must, then if corruption in its allegedly beneficent Soviet and all-embracing form is allowed to flourish—as it is, for instance, in Ukraine—this will surely affect the legitimacy of the postcommunist order, and democracy will be destroyed. Corruption, in fact, threatens to stall the successor states' omnibus in a netherworld of democratic windowdressing and backdoor plunder. It made totalitarianism tolerable, but destroyed it; it can make democracy intolerable and destroy it, too. At least William Clark gets us thinking about the problem.

Bohdan Harasymiw
University of Calgary

QUO VADIS, UKRAÏNO? Edited by *Ihor Ostash*. Library of the International School of Ukrainian Studies, No. 1. Proceedings of the Third (Winter) Session, Kiev, January, 1992. Odessa: Maiak, 1992. 240 pp. ISBN 5-7760-0484-5.

This collection brings together views of leading Ukrainian politicians, academics, and intellectuals, as well as of some of their colleagues from leading U.S. universities. Original papers by outstanding contributors help shed a good deal of light on a wide range of issues of ethno-political, social, cultural, and linguistic development in Ukraine. Also widely covered in the book are the proceedings of two panel discussions involving the questions of the state order and forms of government in Ukraine, and Ukraine's role in the world community.

The book opens with a contribution by Ivan Dzyuba entitled "Ukraine and the World. Ukraine and Russia. Problems and Prospects of Cultural Development in an Independent Ukraine." In his acute examination of a wide spectrum of problems facing Ukraine, he singles out the need for Ukraine to redefine herself in relation to the rest of the world in the light of modern realities, and to do this in a pragmatic and realistic key rather than indulge in romantic reminiscences about glorious pages of her past or her past historical merits before Europe and the sufferings inflicted upon her by other peoples. Of great scholarly and cognitive value is the author's analysis of the economic, ethnic, political, and cultural aspects involved in establishing a sense of identity of the Ukrainian people against the background of Ukraine's historical development. Drawing lessons from the past and taking account of the present, he makes a point of showing the need for Ukraine to take advantage of the current international situation, which is conducive to strengthening her independence.

Characterizing the ethnic composition of the Ukrainian people, Dzyuba shows its complexity and highlights a relatively high level of cohesion among different ethnic groups and their mutual respect for one another, which has a significant role to play in fostering peace, good neighborly relations, mutual cultural enrichment, and Ukraine's international image. With regard to the economic aspects of independence, he focuses on the need to overcome the gap between Ukraine's economy and that of the Western nations by creating the appropriate infrastructure, enabling her to do business with the West effectively. With respect to ideological aspects, he draws the reader's attention to the rich cultural heritage of the Ukrainian democratic and socialist movements as providing an antidote to extreme forms of nationalism, and speaks of the need to retain a highly intellectual and critical level of thought if Ukraine is to become a member of the family of European democracies. Of great interest and relevance to issues of Ukraine's political culture is his treatment of the complex and sensitive subject of her relationship with Russia, with his call to manifest even more tolerance towards the Russians than they may have towards Ukrainians, not blaming the entire people for the blunders of their politicians.

In his treatment of the problems of cultural development, Dzyuba draws an apt parallel between the principle of complementarity in particle physics and the relationship between national and global culture. This shows his adherence to the interdisciplinary approach gaining acceptance in modern political and social science.

Of great interest is a contribution by Roman Szporluk entitled "Reflections and Meditations of an Historian on Present-Day Ukraine." In his terse and lucid style, he offers his sense of the events that took shape in Ukraine between August and December of 1991,

then subjects to analysis the no less dramatic pages of recent history, prior to the Moscow coup of 1991. He develops his subject by ably showing the dynamics of change involving the key historical actors who emerged on the political stage in Kiev after Shcherbytsky's political decline in 1989. In this context, he features the part that was to be played by the Writers' Union of Ukraine in reawakening a sense of national identity. Szporluk describes the regeneration of political life in Ukraine as a process that saw intellectuals and cultural elite groups turning themselves into politicians, and realizing their potential for independent thinking, which had started to develop long before some of them came to power. He gives a separate assessment of the Chornobyl disaster in terms of its political influence on the course of later developments in Ukraine. In Szporluk's view, the way the local and all-Union authorities dealt with this tragedy infused the Ukrainian people with the need to begin looking after their own interests rather than leave the problem in the hands of the all-Union authorities in Moscow. Of great merit is his treatment of the changes in the style of thinking of Ukrainian politicians when President Leonid Kravchuk began his discussions with Rukh.

The article by Alexander Motyl deals with issues involving the definitions of state and nation. The author comes to grips with some of the traditional approaches to these issues, showing their insufficiency. He ably offers his own semiotic approach, based on a modification of Way's concept of the nation as a group of people possessing a shared body of common means of communication. According to this approach, the understanding of nation rests with the idea of a community of people possessing a common mythology exemplified by a shared body of cultural symbols, stories and legends about their own past, customs, folklore, etc. In the light of this approach, Motyl attaches a high semiotic value to the very fact of the 90 percent vote in the referendum for the independence of Ukraine, and rightly sees it as a milestone in the development of a semiotic network in Ukraine, providing her citizens with a much-needed sense of togetherness. Furthermore, the author examines the role of elites—cultural and state—in the development of nations throughout history, and explores the complex relationships between state and nation, the people and elite groups. He convincingly shows how historically, the formation of states may have preceded the formation of nations, even though the nation may exist without the state and vice versa. Also of interest is his examination of a whole variety of nationalistic ideologies and the material and political conditions on which their realization is contingent. In conclusion, Motyl recommends avoiding a repetition, in the development of the Ukrainian nation and its statehood, of some of the mistakes made by the political elites in Africa, with their excessive emphasis on the bureaucratic superstructure and the military, which resulted in their political and economic decline some twenty years after the declarations of independence in their respective countries.

Analyzed in an article by Volodymyr Ievtukh, a scholar from Ukraine, are issues relating to the ethnic and political renaissance in Ukraine. The author examines the structure of the Ukrainian population, its basic layers, and their relationship and numerical strength as it is manifested across the world. He characterizes this renaissance as a process leading towards the attainment by the Ukrainian ethnos of its proper place, as well as to the development of a sovereign Ukrainian nation-state. He singles out language as a crucial distinctive mark of ethnicity, and through his analysis of changes in the ethnic and linguistic situation in Ukraine concludes that the process of Russification has been checked, while the role played by the Ukrainian language is being reinforced. At the same time, Ievtukh realistically assesses the problems involved in implementing the law on the use of Ukrainian as a state language.

Closely related to the previous article is a contribution by Ihor Ostash, also from Ukraine, on the issue of language policy. In his view, our epoch is witnessing the end of the processes of centralization and univèrsalization in relationships among languages, which began with the development of artificial languages like Esperanto. In the light of the political processes now under way in modern Europe relating to the reunification of Germany and the linguistic decolonization of the Near East, India, and Africa, one can surmise that the influence of English will diminish. This trend, in his view, also becomes manifest in comparing the state of English and Russian.

In Ostash's view, a common feature of all language interferences, resulting from the use of these languages as tools for colonization or simply for the spread of spheres of influence, is the development of so-called variants. Thus, one can speak of American, Indian, Australian, and other variants of English, which absorb the substratum elements of the indigenous languages. This state of affairs evokes much criticism on the part of language purists as well as supporters of high language culture. This language disease, to the extent that the causes of it are political, may be alleviated as the political climate changes. The opposite trend, in the author's view, is the process of heightening the status of other national languages which were pushed to the fringe in their development and now seem to be trying to gain ascendancy.

Ostash focuses on the linguistic situation in Ukraine after the adoption of the law on the state language, confronts the problems in the wake of its implementation, and stresses the need to lay the main emphasis on the education of younger generations through a widening network of Ukrainian schools. Of great scholarly interest is the author's analysis of the origins of the Ukrainian language, which he tries to trace back to the eleventh century. He seeks to show that a Ukrainian version of early Slavic began to take shape approximately at that period. At the same time, the author acknowledges that the view that the Ukrainian language originated in the fourteenth century, based on the evidence of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century legislative acts, is the most widely accepted. He concludes his article by reviewing the top priorities for the development of the Ukrainian language today, stressing the need to elaborate the means of raising the prestige of the Ukrainian language in Ukraine.

In an article by Oleksii Haran', another scholar from Ukraine, the reader is confronted with a penetrating analysis of the development of the political situation in Ukraine between the fall of 1990 and the summer of 1991. The author ably examines a wide range of political parties now active in Ukraine, with an emphasis on their programs and their abilities to establish coalitions and to have a real impact on the course of reforms. He concludes his analysis by saying that the democratic forces in Ukraine have to an extent proved unprepared for the hard day-to-day labor of reconstruction.

The rest of the book is devoted to coverage of round-table discussions on the issues of statehood and forms of government in Ukraine, and also of the relationship between Ukraine and the world community.

The value of this collection lies in the fact that the materials are well researched, well documented and clearly presented. It is a long-awaited contribution to Ukrainian studies.

Vadim Voinov
Harvard University

ANTI-COMMUNIST STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS AND THE POLISH RENEWAL. By *Charles Wankel.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992. 288 pp. $49.95 cloth.

The emergence of this book makes us realize an astounding fact: almost no attention at all has thus far been paid by Western scholars investigating the roots of the downfall of communism in Eastern and Central Europe to the role of student movements and independent student organizations in precipitating the momentous event. At the same time, it would be hard to imagine an observer of the scene during the late 1970s and early 1980s who would have been myopic enough to miss the tangible and, in certain cases, spectacular presence of student protest actions in the area of public life. This discrepancy seems to be particularly distressing in the case of Poland, where the student movement called Niezależne Zrzeszenie Studentów (Independent Students' Association) was created as early as 1977, as a direct response to what was suspected to have been a secret police murder in the city of Cracow of a prodemocracy student activist, Stanisław Pyjas. His martyrdom had an effect comparable to that of Jan Palach's death in neighboring Czechoslovakia: it provided the movement with its personal emblem and spurred the rapid growth of antitotalitarian sentiment among the young. Their resistance eventually took on many different shapes, from initiating serious debates over the academic curricula and the state's educational policies to staging occupation strikes at universities to sometimes deliberately grotesque or absurdist performances of a sort of street circus, the most famous example of which was the Wrocław-based group calling itself tauntingly the Orange Alternative.

The reason why the student input in the Polish reformist revolution (or, as Timothy Garton Ash would have it, "refolution") has been so neglected by Western historians seems to lie in the ideological bias that affects most of them. The traditional opposition between the liberal and conservative mindsets has weighed upon the very choice of a thematic focus here and ultimately produced the abundance of analyses which highlight one-sidedly either the economic grievances of the working class or the nationalistic-religious syndrome as the sole cause of the historic change in 1980 and afterwards. Such phenomena as the student movement do not fit so nicely into the traditional categories; after all, diversity was precisely what they were after.

Charles Wankel's book fills the existing gap in at least a preliminary manner, that is, by providing us with a systematic and detailed account of the complex history of Polish independent (i.e., not state-sponsored and state-controlled) student organizations, particularly the NZS, from the years before the emergence of Solidarity until the political breakthrough in 1989. His account, based on thorough research that included both archival work and oral interviews with the movement's former participants, reaches deeply in both the historical and the geographic sense by situating the issue against an aptly sketched background of the history of Poland's prodemocracy manifestations (and not merely those which took place in major academic communities such as Warsaw or Cracow). It is precisely the generously broad scope of investigation combined with the sound analysis of detailed facts that seems to be the book's chief merit.

At the same time, the Polish case provides the author with a sort of theoretical springboard as well. The questions that interest him in this area are summed up in the titles of the second and third of the book's three major chapters: "How Local Events Drove the National Movement" and "How a Small Number of Prior Clandestine Activists Came to Found and Control a Large National Student Movement Organization." In other words,

Wankel does not stop at reconstructing the facts as they happened in both their temporal order and simultaneous parallelity; he also tries to dissect the factual material in order to discover some general regularities having to do with "the domination of macro-level policy by micro-level decisions." In particular, his aim is to find out whether the success of the NZS was due more to its own activists' prior experience as collaborators of human rights groups such as the KOR (Workers' Defense Committee) or to the external support from Solidarity, once the latter came into existence. While his conclusions in this area seem to do not much more than confirm intuitive expectations ("The case of the NZS displays that *both* a pre-existing network and contemporaneous support by a powerful ally can be crucial factors in the establishment of a successful movement organization" [p. 193]), the wealth of factual material alone would be enough to make one appreciate the valuable service that his book renders to the reader.

Stanisław Barańczak
Harvard University

CHRONICLE

Ukrainian Studies in Italy, 1920–1990

EMANUELA SGAMBATI

In November 1920 Giovanni Maver inaugurated the first official Slavic studies course in Italy, at Padua. That year saw the beginning of an increase in Slavic studies, in response to "a glaring necessity in the postwar period, that the new Italian state should correct an omission in its cultural outlook and catch up with Germany and France, countries which had preceded it into this field by several decades" (Maver 1931, 6). This was also reflected in Ukrainian studies.

At the beginning of this report, I would like to clarify certain methodological criteria used for analysis of materials. First of all, let us discuss my understanding of the term "Ukrainian studies." There are two possible definitions for this term. The first definition is broader, including the study of language and literature together with a study of history, civilization and culture; the second definition is limited to the study of comparative language and literature, both on the diachronic and synchronic levels. Given the nature of the problems connected with these studies and the interdisciplinary nature of related studies, it becomes difficult if not impossible to clearly separate the various sectors. Therefore, I have decided to include in this article (which is the first of its type), not only studies dedicated to linguistics and literature, but also works pertaining to cultural and historical facts as they intertwine with language and culture and make up the whole of the civilization I am studying.

A second point regards the sphere, or rather the territory where this discipline has developed—that is, the adjective "Italian" when referring to a discipline understood as being born and developed in Italy.

In principle, I must agree with those—such as Maver (1931, 13) and Graciotti (1983, 6)—who state that a discipline must be considered "Italian" when it is made up of Italian scholars. However, an examination of materials pertaining to Ukrainian studies has led me to the conclusion that many of these works were the work of Ukrainians. These works were produced within the Italian cultural context, and therefore, their works must be considered, above and beyond any ethnic distinctions, part of Italian production. This position is supported by the fact that in America (Harvard, Alberta, etc.), Ukrainian studies are represented above all by highly placed scholars of Ukrainian origin. With regard to Italy, Luigi Salvini writes as follows about the work of Eugen Onatskyj (Jevhen Onac'kyj):

"His scholarly work has given our Slavic studies the greatest and most modern instruments available today for the study of Ukrainian language; this makes Onatskyj our most authoritative scholar on the Ukrainian question" (Onatskyj 1939, vi).

I must also clarify the criterion I used to organize this study. Since the 1920s, interest in Slavic literature and cultures has developed in various forms. Undoubtedly, the greatest development was in Russian language and literature, and after that in Polish, Czech, and so on. In contrast, Ukrainian studies seem almost nonexistent. Literary and even general works are few and far between; there are many more articles on literature, history, politics, geography, etc. Given the scarcity and lack of continuity in scholarly works, it would be impossible to categorize the materials into well-defined periods or eras. Hence I have decided to study these works while following (with a few exceptions) a purely chronological sequence.

Except for some literary essays and translations of limited value (Rossaro 1920, Ettilinger-Fano 1921, Lipovezka 1921), there were very few Ukrainian studies articles in the 1920s, and for the most part these regarded historical-political questions (Gafenko 1921, Franceschini 1921, Singalevitc [Volodymyr Singalevyč] 1922, Italico 1927, Jeremiew 1929).

Of all these, two works on Ukraine are worthy of consideration, due to the extraordinary personage of Aurelio Palmieri, a man of rare intelligence and culture with an uncommonly wide range of interests, which can be seen in the ample reach of his writings. His major interest was religious and theological studies, which he dedicated mostly to the Russian Church and the problems of the Church Union. He authored various works on this subject, mainly his great two-volume work *Theologia dogmatica Orthodoxa (Ecclesiae graeco-russicae) ad lumen Catholicae doctrinae examinata et discussa* (Florence, 1911–1913), which remains to this day a fundamental work on Orthodox dogmatic theology. He was an ardent supporter of the Union (in fact, the work is dedicated to Metropolitan A. Šeptyc'kyj). From these preeminently religious and theological interests, his great curiosity led him to extend his field of studies even further. We note that from 1922 through 1926 he was "a learned, assiduous and dedicated collaborator" of the Institute for Eastern Europe, where he was head of the Slavic section, as was commemorated in his obituary in the review *L'Europa Orientale* in 1926, the year of his death.

What was the Institute for Eastern Europe? The Institute was founded in 1921 through the initiative of an organizing committee made up of F. Ruffini, G. Gentile, N. Festa, G. Prezzolini, U. Zanotti Bianco, A. Giannini, and Ettore Lo Gatto. Under the guidance of Lo Gatto, this institute continued its work until its closing in 1945, which was due to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs suspending funding. The goal of the Institute was to study and disseminate Eastern European cultures, from Estonia and Lithuania to Albania, with particular regard to Slavic cultures. The fruit of this attention was a ponderous series of publications (its principal journal was *L'Europa Orientale*), monographs, and manuals. In the

period of his collaboration with *L'Europa Orientale*, Palmieri also wrote two short but significant articles on Ukraine.

The first appeared on 1 August 1924 in the review *Lo spettatore italiano—Rivista letteraria dell'Italia nuova* and was entitled "The Literary History of Ruthenia" (pp. 69–75). It should be mentioned here that Palmieri uses the terms "Ruthenia" and "Ukraine," "Ruthenian" and "Ukrainian," as synonyms, not taking into account the fact that "Ruthenia" does not traditionally indicate solely Ukraine, but all the lands that today include Ukraine and Belarus, and that the term "Ruthenian language" traditionally refers to the common language—albeit in its numerous variations—used in Ruthenian lands, beginning with the first annexations of these lands by Lithuania, and their later union with Poland through Lithuania in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, until the partitioning of Ukraine between Poland and Muscovy in 1667. The work is only a few pages long, but of fundamental importance: first, because it represents the first essay dedicated specifically to Ukrainian literature by an Italian; second, because it clarifies and specifies the existence and autonomy of the Ukrainian language and literature in a scholarly context, apart from the prejudices and ambiguities created by competing political interests.

Palmieri confirms the existence of a Ukrainian language, with its morphosyntactic and lexical peculiarities distinguishing it from other Slavic languages, and with its own history. Although he was a friend of Ukraine, he supports this position not with nationalist sentiments, but by basing himself on the works of accredited scholars such as A. Meillet. He also confirms the existence of an autonomous Ukrainian literature and describes its principal characteristics and—showing his objectivity—its limits. He particularly accents a peculiarity of Ukrainian literature—its traditional openness and even passion for every new form of Western art or culture, counterposed to the closure and isolationism of Muscovite culture up to the era of Peter I, manifested not only in the Ukrainians' desire to know these new forms, but to make these forms their own. He also mentions the numbers of Ukrainian students studying in foreign universities, and the opening in Ukraine of academies where Latin was used for all classroom teaching.

Another specification by Palmieri regards the first period of literary history, the period from its origins to the destruction of Kiev (1240), which Palmieri states belongs to both Russian and Ukrainian history and literature. He adopts a solution of great historical acumen, considering this "disputed" period as "a period of literary communality between Great Russia and Little Russia." "The literature of the two countries," he states, "represents two streams flowing from the same source, their waters flowing in two currents that for a certain time seem parallel and which finally diverge, and after a long journey flow into two different oceans" (Palmieri 1924, 74). Therefore, Palmieri adopts a unifying formula for resolving this prickly question. What is important is that, thanks to his great literary, historical, and religious knowledge of those peoples, together with the openness

proceeding from his rare culture and intelligence, in the 1920s he supported a thesis of initial literary communality only reaffirmed in these last few years; further, the contemporary reaffirmation of this position is not always explicit and possesses a subtle, almost imperceptible tinge of preeminence for the Russian culture (Colucci-Picchio 1990, 902–903).

Even more significant is Palmieri's reference to the enigmatic and contradictory figure of Prokopovyč, whose primary significance to Ukrainian literary and cultural history is obvious to Palmieri. Palmieri refers to Prokopovyč as "the most famous representative of Ukrainian religious and lay culture in the period when Great Russia, according to the famous phrase by Pushkin, attempted in vain to incorporate all the Slavic currents as its own" (Palmieri 1924, 75). Palmieri refers to the dramatic play *Vladymyr* as "having a place of honor in Ukrainian theatrical literature in the eighteenth century."

Palmieri's second work dedicated to Ukraine, entitled "The Political Geography of Soviet Ukraine," appeared in 1926 in the review *L'Europa Orientale* (pp. 65–81). In this essay, the scholar outlines a geopolitical profile of Ukraine based on historical documentation, as we see in its ample bibliography. Mainly, Palmieri reviews the history of Ukraine from the first years of the eighteenth century through 1925, considering the fundamental moments first of tsarist oppression and later of Bolshevik repression; he also considers the historical-political and cultural process which led to the formation of Ukrainian national consciousness. Palmieri particularly accentuates the role of Bolshevism, showing all its negatives while mentioning that in destroying the tsarist empire and hence neutralizing tsarist repression of various nationalities, Bolshevism involuntarily led to a "period of national evolution." Palmieri foresaw a rapid end to terroristic dictatorship, after which the USSR was to have endured, in his words, national rebirths, where the problems of diverse nationalities would find just and equitable solutions. Unfortunately, history has shown his predictions to be overly optimistic, but we also see how acutely he foreshadowed the events of today.

Also appearing in the 1920s were some exemplary essays on literature written by Wolf Giusti (1924, 1926a, 1926b, 1927). Among these essays we note one on the Ukrainian poet Pavlo Tyčyna. This essay, which appeared in 1927 in the *Rivista di letterature slave*, was only two pages long, but these are two pages to be remembered. This is the only essay to have appeared in Italy on this great Ukrainian poet, unknown to this day to most Western Slavic scholars. This essay also shows us Giusti's breadth and great scholarly curiosity. The writing is exceptional; Giusti succeeded in distilling, notwithstanding the difficulty of Tyčyna's language, some illuminating thoughts on the basic elements of Tyčyna's poetry: the simplicity and formal clarity together with the extraordinary richness of language; the melodies, based on folk songs, and the polychromy and polyphony of the poet's images and ambience. Giusti's work has a twofold merit: first, that he brought to light a relative unknown and placed him on a level with the great personages of Ukrainian literature; second, that he understood Tyčyna's

value at a time when only three or four of the poet's anthologies had been published).

From the end of the 1920s through the 1930s interest in Ukraine grew, partly for political and economic reasons, and hence the number of studies on Ukraine grew as well. Works appeared in various reviews, mostly of the historical, political, and economic variety (Scrimali 1938, Trevisonno 1939, Ademollo 1939), or geopolitical essays (Magnino C. 1933, Cipriani 1934, Gobbi Belcredi 1935, 1939, Stefano Grande 1936, Conforto 1938, De Luca 1938, Magnino L. 1939); there were some literary essays as well (Lazzarino 1935, Damiani 1939).

A unitary thread can be found here in the works of Eugen Onatskyj, which were gathered together in 1939 in an anthology edited by Luigi Salvini and entitled *Studi di storia e di cultura ucraina (Studies on Ukrainian History and Culture).* It was due to Salvini's efforts that in 1936 the Royal Eastern Institute of Higher Learning in Naples initiated its first course on Ukrainian language and civilization, which was entrusted to Onatskyj and continued until 1943.

The volume collects a series of articles published beginning in 1928 in various reviews, such as *L'Europa Orientale*, the Annals of the Royal Eastern Institute of Higher Learning of Naples, etc., pertaining to various aspects of Ukrainian culture, language, art, history, and folklore. Onatskyj's goals were twofold in these works: first, he wished to highlight the variety, complexity, and (despite contrary appearances) continuity of Ukrainian culture; second, he wished to historically document various confirmations of an authentic and autonomous Ukrainian language, literature, history, and culture, and to demonstrate the historical manipulations wrought by Russians as well as Poles to negate Ukraine's existence.

The character, quality, and scholarly level of these studies were varied. "The Ukrainian Language in the Family of Slavic Languages," an essay in which the author attempted a comparative linguistic analysis of the Ukrainian language with other Slavic languages, was notably mediocre. Evidently, Onatskyj was in unfamiliar territory, made visible by a certain ambiguity in his writing and especially by the errors, imprecise statements, and confusions present in the text (for example, pp. 90, 91, 97–99). He also exalted far too vehemently the beauty of the Ukrainian language with respect to other Slavic languages.

A much more concise and organic essay was his work confronting the problem (already considered more briefly in a previous article in 1928 which we will discuss later) of the semantic subtleties of the terms "Rus'" and "Ukraine" (1936). Onatskyj confronts two problems: first, the origin of the two names; second, the development and ethnic composition of the peoples indicated by these terms, studying these terms in the chronological context of a historical process stretching to the present day.

Highly illustrative are Onatsky's essays dedicated to Ukrainian folklore, where he systematically analyzes and compares its elements and characteristics to those of other peoples. The most important articles for the comprehension of the reality called Ukraine, however, are the articles entitled "The Ukrainian Problem through-

out History" and "The Limits of Europe." In the first article, published in 1928 in *L'Europa Orientale*, Onatskyj outlines Ukrainian history, underlining and analyzing crucial moments regarding the Ukrainian question. I would like to mention that this article gave rise to a violent reaction from Prince A. Wolkonsky (Volkonskij), who attacked Onatskyj unjustly and at great length in an article (1929). Hence an interesting polemic developed between the two, chronicled in the 1929 issues of *L'Europa Orientale*; we cannot examine these exchanges in this study, but they would merit a separate study by an impartial observer.

The second article appeared in 1936 in the Annals of the Royal Eastern Institute of Higher Learning of Naples. Here Onatskyj examines at first the particular historical and cultural role played, since the times of Jaroslav, by Ukraine as the meeting point and synthesis between Western and Eastern civilization. He then goes on to demonstrate that Ukraine belongs to European (Western) civilization. He uses many arguments to demonstrate this thesis: some geographical, where he is sometimes too clever for his own good, and others of a historical and cultural character. Some of his points deserve mention, both in and of themselves and also because they foreshadowed areas of research not yet developed at that time, some of which has appeared in a systematic manner only in the last few years. One point regards the relations in the eleventh and twelfth centuries between the Kievan court and other European courts, which Onatskyj chronicles with examples (1936, 37–40). Another regards Ukraine's role in the defense of Europe against Asian invasions by the Tatars and later by the Turks; this role was much misunderstood by historians, but was much appreciated by historical figures such as Richelieu and Mazarin. He also examines in general the relations between Ukraine and Europe, in particular the great openness towards European culture demonstrated by the "heretical" Ukrainian culture in times when Muscovy was completely closed upon itself (note that Palmieri had mentioned this fact in his works over a decade earlier). This openness, thanks to the works and activities of persons such as Peter Mohyla, made Kiev a center of European culture for all of Eastern Europe. Hence the role of Ukrainians as "Europeanizers" of Russian culture, when the Russians, under Peter I, finally cast off their isolation.

Although they did not always adhere to rigidly scholarly criteria, particularly in the pathos pervading many passages, Onatskyj's studies still offer an ample and detailed picture of the history and culture of a country and of a people whose existence had to that time been ignored, if not denied. We also owe to Onatskyj his bilingual dictionary and his grammar of the Ukrainian language. The grammar was published in Naples in 1937; his dictionary appeared in two editions. The first part, Ukrainian-Italian, appeared in 1941; due to wartime and postwar events the second, Italian-Ukrainian, was only published in 1977. We must note the lacunae in both the grammar and the dictionary, although the results of the two texts seem to me to be worthy of note. We must take into consideration Onatskyj's lack of methodological preparation in the linguistic and didactic areas, and of the familiarity resulting from longstanding experience with a specific discipline.

An emerging figure in the field of Ukrainian studies in the thirties and forties—one that is in great measure important to this day—is Luigi Salvini. We have already mentioned that it was through his efforts that courses in Ukrainian civilization and culture were established. This initiative, which was interrupted in 1943 due to wartime events, was only recommenced in 1970, and ended definitively not long after. A similar initiative was taken by Picchio in Rome in 1963 and a second time by Graciotti in 1977. Unfortunately, today this course remains the only one of its kind in Italy. But Salvini's greatest work was that of an impassioned scholar of Ukrainian literature. From 1937 through 1939–40 he published about twenty essays, translations, and reviews; in particular, he wrote about two authors who were unknown for many years and who only today are being truly appreciated: Stefanyk and Xvyl'ovyj. However, the most important works by Salvini are the introductions to his two published anthologies. The first appeared in 1941 and was entitled *Le quattro sciabole (The Four Sabres)*; this is the title of a work by Janovs'kyj, but Salvini was probably referring to an anthology of the same name, albeit of differing content, in Ukrainian, published in 1938 in Paris and reviewed by him in *L'Europa Orientale* two years earlier. The second work, which appeared in 1949, was entitled *L'altopiano dei pastori (The Highland of the Shepherds).*

The first anthology collected the works of a wide variety of authors, from older ones like Kobyljans'ka to younger ones such as Lypa and "purged" Party orthodox such as Xvyl'ovyj. The goal was not so much to illustrate the tendencies and characteristics of various literary currents, as to show, through the writings of authors from different schools, the existence of a globally unified and nationally representative phenomenon. Salvini's choice was a good one. His historical and political descriptions, where he studies the development of contemporary Ukrainian literature, are clear and precise. Likewise clear are the fundamental characteristics he discovers in this literature (which are also valid for contemporary authentic Ukrainian literature): the political engagement of the majority of the writers who create combative and revolutionary literature; the sentiment of contemporary betrayal, which leads them to rediscovery of the past, not in myths, but in history, and of betrayal at the hands of the world, leading them to the reaffirmation of a national consciousness; finally, the contact established in this process between contemporary literature and the ancient popular epics from which it appropriates and reelaborates motivations, forms, rhythms, and melodies.

Also important is Salvini's schematic and precise examination, done without pathos, but also without facile and simplistic expedients, regarding the factors which have determined the fate of Ukrainian literature. This examination is made difficult, as he himself states, by the reexamination of very complex historical events with the help of such an incomplete historical record. Sometimes we see the incompleteness even in the author's preparation. For example, when writing on Ukrainian literature at the end of the eighteenth century, he states that the *Eneïda* of Kotljarevs'kyj is the beginning of "modern literature and the Western orientation" (p. 19). He restates this later: "We affirm, moreover, a concordance between

Europe and Ukraine that would not be interrupted, and which allowed an exit from the overly closed, provincial, and popular Orthodox medieval culture" (p. 20). Now, if relations with the West had not at that point reached continuity, it was also true that such an opening had taken place almost two centuries earlier: note the Western character of Kievan culture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the teaching of the Mohyla Academy; above all, note the relevance of the Ukrainian baroque which, as we see from the attention of contemporary authors such as Graciotti and Picchio, was during its active period in the Ruthenian territories a high cultural synthesis of the values of the European West and East.

Salvini's introductory study of 1949 continues that of 1941; some parts of the previous study are repeated to the letter, others are amplified (for example, the portion on Kotljarevs'kyj and the beginnings of romanticism, the portion on Ševčenko, as well as on Franko and his influence on modern narrative), and enriched by new elements, such as the brief but incisive excursus on Skovoroda. The discourse on Kocjubyns'kyj is amplified and deepened, and Salvini shows a fine intuition not only of his linguistic genius but also of his more characteristic elements: the love of goodness and beauty, and faith in the value of the individual—not as part of a collective, nor as hero or victim of an epoch.

In addition, there were three works of the years immediately preceding the war which, though more modest than Salvini's, deserve mention: those of Bondioli (1939, reprinted in 1941), of Aillaud and Pozzani (1941), and of Pullé (1942), all written with an openly popular outlook, but varied in their approach and critical breadth. The work of Bondioli, *Ucraina. Terra del pane* (*Ukraine: Land of Bread*) has a compilational, illustrative, and encyclopedic character, which even with its errors and imprecisions remains a good instrument of general information, as is noted by Insabato in his preface to the edited reprinting of 1941. Aillaud and Pozzani, in their work *Ucraina. Cenni storici ed economici* (*Ukraine: Historical and Economic Notes*), examine particularly the juridical aspect of events and of the most controversial questions of Ukrainian history, such as the nature of juridical relations between Ukraine and Muscovy as codified in their 1654 treaty (pp. 25–26). Also interesting is their statement on the positive influence exercised by Roman law, modified by Magdeburg law, on Ukrainian law (p. 15). Pullé, in his book *Ucraina*, is less problematic in confronting ethnic, historical, and political questions regarding Ukraine, while he is very precise and detailed in his geomorphological analysis of the country and in the presentation of its hydrographic and anthropic outlines; also worthy of mention is his examination of the economic structures of the period ending in 1240.

In the period between the world wars Ukraine returned to prominence, and consequently there was a greater interest in its history, culture, etc., which we can see in the studies we have mentioned in passing. On the contrary, for a long period after the war, Ukraine was once again almost entirely forgotten. No study or article particularly on this question appeared at all. The only exceptions were the popular works of Wasyl Fedoronczuk, a Ukrainian who worked in Rome as editor of the

review *Ucraina*, which appeared in 1954 and was appreciated by Amedeo Giannini. Fedoronczuk in part reexamined the history of the "Ukrainian question" (1955), and in part described the political, cultural, and literary situation of Soviet Ukraine (1966a; 1966b). But due to their impassioned tone and the vehemence with which they are written, Fedoronczuk's works, especially the latter two, take on the character of anti-Soviet tracts, which notably diminishes their informative and historical value.

Every so often an essay on Ukrainian language, literature, and history would appear in some general compendium. Of these, the only one deserving consideration was authored by Ettore Lo Gatto in the *Storia delle letterature moderne d'Europa* (*History of Modern Literatures of Europe*, 1958). This is a brief profile of Ukrainian literature given in a schematic and essential form, and provides a great deal of data. However, especially in its consideration of old Ukrainian literature, the perspective of this work is typical of a Russian scholar and is not at all inclined to a Ukrainocentric view of historical facts. Ukraine appears very infrequently in more general historical works, even in the wide-ranging historical works of Picchio (1970) and Tamborra (1973) dedicated to Eastern Europe. Regarding Tamborra, I would like to note a personal regret, that while in his work, "so wide-ranging and chronologically vast is his concept of 'Eastern Europe'," as Clara Castelli has rightly stated (Tamborra 1986, xxxiii), Ukraine has not found its proper, even small, place.

Here I would accentuate two ecclesiastical-historical series published in the fifties and sixties. The first is entitled *Documenta romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae*, which is a part (Section 3, Series 2) of the publications *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni*, edited by the Basilian Fathers and published beginning in 1952–53. It contains documents (in twelve sections) from Roman archives concerning the history of the Ukrainian and Belarusian Church gathered by Athanasius Welykyj, who also edited the publication (which continues today under his successors). The second work is the *Monumenta Ucrainae historica*, first published in 1964 under the patronage of Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj. Here we find Roman archival documents gathered from the beginning of our century by Metropolitan Andrej Šeptyc'kyj with the assistance of Fr. Cyril Korolevs'kyj. The question arises: Why two series of publications for essentially the same documents? The history of the gathering and publication of these documents is long, complex, and controversial (note the polemic between Korolevs'kyj and Welykyj when a single series was proposed). Also, the editorial criteria were different for the two series. The Basilian series gathers documents in twelve groups, generally following the organization of these documents in the archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The *Monumenta* organizes documents chronologically, and within the chronological groupings documents are organized by subject. More could be said about the varied editorial criteria, but not in a study of this character. I would like to mention here a study by Omeljan Pritsak on the works of Welykyj, which contains a detailed description

of the *Documenta* and of its various sections (Pritsak 1985). What is important is that these series are a fundamental and indispensable resource for anyone wishing to study Ukrainian (and, to a lesser degree, Belarusian) history or culture, as I have sought to demonstrate in my paper presented at the First International Congress of Ukrainian Studies, held in Kiev in 1990, and likewise in a later article, "Ukrainian Studies and 'Roman' Ukrainians in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," published in 1991 (Sgambati 1991).

A new and positive impulse for Ukrainian studies has occurred in recent years, as we see in the Ravenna International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine. Many noted scholars participated (Peri, Picchio, Carile, Dell'Agata, Brogi Bercoff, Colucci, Minissi, Maniscalco Basile, Giraudo, Morini). Their subjects were wide-ranging, covering various aspects and problems of the Christianization of Rus' and of the culture and civilization of Rus'.

More contributions to the discussion of Ukrainian issues were made at the conference entitled "The Baptism of the Rus' Lands: The Balance of a Millennium," held in Venice and Rome in 1988. I note especially the contribution of Peri (Peri 1991), analyzing the events and political and ecclesiastical positions in the period before the Union of Brest, and that of Senyk on the ideology, universality, thoughts, and works of Veljamyn Ruts'kyj (Senyk 1991).

Another very important occasion was the congress held in Naples in 1989 dedicated specifically to the problems and perspectives of Ukrainian culture. Many works were presented there (Dell'Agata, Graziosi, Picchio) and at the International Congress of Ukrainian Studies held in Kiev in August and September of 1990 (Graciotti, Maniscalco Basile, Sgambati, Senyk, Ziffer). The contributions are extremely varied in character, from textual critiques (Ziffer), to literary issues (Dell'Agata, Graciotti, Picchio), culture and ideology (Sgambati), and examinations of historical events from a political (Graziosi) or juridical (Maniscalco Basile) perspective. The principal importance of the recent contributions is that at last Ukrainian studies have shaken off the popular nature that to some degree always characterized them, and have finally taken on the character of active research (see also the study by Sgambati, 1983, on the determining influence of the "Ruthenians" on the choice of which language to adopt in the seventeenth-century reprintings of Glagolitic Croatian liturgical texts), contributions capable of joining original contributions in the field of scholarly knowledge.

We should add to these thoughts on Ukrainian and Belarusian literature some other considerations either not mentioned or poorly stated. I refer here to writings by historians of Russian literature, or by Slavists who occasionally write about the Ukrainian and Belarusian cultural figures who dominated pre-Petrine and Petrine literary and cultural life: Połacki, Javors'kyj, and especially Prokopovyč, as well as many others. The Russocentric perspective of these writers leads them to ignore or undervalue not only these authors' heritage, but likewise their value vis-à-vis Russian culture, skewing their historical perception. Lo Gatto wrote in 1959: "To consider Simeon Polockij, Dmitrij Tuptalo or Feofan Prokopovič, who are noted

in Russian literary history, as making up part of Ukrainian literature because they are of Ukrainian origin, would be an error, because they, and especially Prokopovič, are organically bound to Moscow and its development" (p. 250). In 1975, in the volume *Profilo della letteratura russa* (*Profile of Russian Literature*), he defines Prokopovyč's work *Vladymyr* as "the first work of Russian classicism" (p. 55). More recently Baracchi, in his article "The Humanistic Heritage in the *Poetics* of Feofan Prokopovyč," published in 1989, writes: "But, aside from Horace and Aristotle, there also appear echoes of the poetry of Giulio Cesare Scaligero or Marco Girolamo Vida, and (sometimes critical) allusions to the Jesuits Jacob Pontano and Famiano Strada, while the richness of citations both of sacred and secular authors known to him, in addition to showing his deep and varied culture, make him an authentic Russian humanist of the eighteenth century" (p. 16). In 1990, Picchio wrote as follows:

> ...the Petrine age did not leave a lasting impression in the literary field. The first thirty years of the eighteenth century could be considered a period of crisis, if not obscurity. Narrative remained at levels of almost primitive popularity, and the theater possessed no voice which rose above the performance of mediocre repetitions of imported texts.... Only Feofan Prokopovyč ... showed at the same time an opening toward new horizons and a continuity with the finest previous traditions. His rhetorical and poetic treatises, together with the tragicomedy *Vladymyr* and his many theoretical and polemical writings, reflect what is most illuminating in the period of Peter the Great." (p. 908)

As we can see, it is mostly on the personality of Prokopovyč and on his function in the era of the "culture of Peter the Great" that we find errors. Contrary to what Lo Gatto writes, Prokopovyč must be considered in light of his Ukrainian origin, his cultural formation at the Mohyla Academy in Kiev, his relations with Polish culture and, through this latter culture, with that of Western Europe. How can we state that *Vladymyr* was a Russian theatrical work, when it was composed in 1705 in Kiev in the cultural atmosphere of the Mohyla Academy, where Feofan, having returned the previous year from Rome, taught rhetoric and poetry? Shevelov has demonstrated in an exemplary manner how *Vladymyr* contains elements proper to Kievan mythology: the myth of Kiev as the Second Jerusalem, contrary to that of Moscow as the Third Rome, which was of Muscovite origin (Shevelov 1985, 216–21). The literary genre of "tragicomedy" is well established in the Kievan literary tradition, before passing (through Prokopovyč) into the Russian tradition, and through Kozačyns'kyj (Erčić 1980) into the Serbian tradition. Finally, it would seem to me risky to state, as does Picchio, that Prokopovyč's activities "reflect what is most illuminating in the period of Peter the Great." Perhaps it would be more precise and less equivocal to say "what is most illuminating of what the 'intellectuals' of Kiev gave to the era of Peter the Great," which would better evidence the importance of Prokopovyč the Ukrainian in the development of Russian culture in the Petrine era. Prokopovyč's relations with the Kievan and Roman schools merit a more detailed treatment, along with a more detailed study

of this disquieting Ukrainian genius. However, it would seem to me that to affirm only that Prokopovyč belonged to Russian literature, without reference to his Kievan activity, would be a falsification (even if indirect) of this historic figure and his importance in the era of Peter I.

As a result of these considerations, we can clearly see that a true and proper discipline of Ukrainian studies has never existed in Italy, while other disciplines, such as Russian and Polish studies, have in fact developed. We should ask ourselves why. We cannot agree with Cronia, who regrettably states that "there was not much to study" (Cronia 1958, 636). There are, however, many reasons for this state of affairs. The fundamental reason is that Ukraine was never an entity independent of "Mother Russia," and earlier of the Polish-Lithuanian state, and hence was considered as a regional entity within these two state structures. I note here Morandi's words on the nation-state relationship:

> The principle of nationality, which sees a correspondence between the confines of states and those of nations, and the appeal to the rights of peoples, are in reality founded on one assumption: that first there exist "peoples," and that at a certain point these constitute themselves into nations which gain their own states. But history has always proceeded in exactly the opposite direction. It is states that form nations, encompassing and grouping together diverse ethnic groups which then elaborate the image of a single "people," with great efforts to base this grouping on a community of language, religion, cultural traditions, or "race." But these two never coincide—that is, they belong to different spheres—and the notion of a single people has always led to a long series of falsifications.

As Giraudo states in his study (Giraudo 1992) analyzing what has been written on Ukraine since ancient times: "There are few even today who affirm that Ukraine constitutes an ethnic, linguistic and cultural reality." In addition to these thoughts, which could influence even impartial observers and scholars, such as non-Ukrainians, there is also the more specific political fact directed intentionally against the linguistic, literary, and cultural autonomy of this country, represented by the repression exercised by the tsarist regime against the study of Ukrainian language and literature from the times of Peter I (note that the first prohibition against printing in Ukrainian dates from 1720) and more recently by the Soviet regime. Even though the violent methods of the tsarist regime were not used during the Soviet period against the literary language, its use was subordinated to that of the Russian language in the administration and the school, and it endured ghettoization as a literature for the few, isolated and provincial. Poland bears no less responsibility for the same type of actions during its rule, and it was only in Austrian Galicia that we see the rebirth of a Ukrainian press and school, simultaneous with the recognition of Ukrainian as one of the region's administrative languages. All this led to an unnatural development of literary life in these two countries, which led to a skewed perspective from which even well-intentioned scholars studied Ukrainian literary and linguistic phenomena; this was especially

true of foreign scholars. Neighboring scholars and scholars of the literature of neighboring countries have studied Ukrainian literature from the point of view of their own literature, and hence treated its Ukrainian counterpart as something peripheral. A correct procedure would require that one begin at the heart of the people in question and that the facts, once interpreted in light of those larger cultures surrounding Ukraine, instead be interpreted as the fruits of indigenous creation, even when these latter works were based on those of neighboring countries.

As regards the Italian situation, it could be described in the framework of Maver's lamentation on Slavic studies in 1931:

> In order not to be superficial, but well documented, in order to see things close-up based on a rich bibliography, we have ended up observing and evaluating literary facts of the Slavic world with the criteria of scholars to whom we turned for more certain and precise information. Instead of being the masters of bibliographic materials, we have become its slaves. Hence our works have ended up being only superficially Italian, while in reality the writer in question was examined by us according to the critical traditions and methods of others. Now it would be useful for us to know how Slavs themselves evaluate and judge their poets; but in that case, we should allow them to speak directly to us.... (p. 13)

Having arrived at this point, we should apply to Ukrainian studies what this great scholar then observed regarding Slavic studies in general: we need to assert that our scholars must take the original works of Ukrainian authors and begin to study them using the same critical maturity and hermeneutic acuteness applied to the study of other languages and literatures. Specific tasks may be varied and diverse, and pose many ideological and methodological problems. We need to study contemporary Ukrainian literature as well as literary manifestations of the last two centuries, in a linguistic-cultural and literary context of mediation and passage between the Greek and Latin worlds, between the ecclesiastical and popular Slavic traditions, between indigenous culture and increasingly broad European currents. In this perspective, we should reconsider personages such as Połacki, Javors'kyj, Prokopovyč, and others. We should also reconsider—as was proposed in the historical-philological field by Giraudo in his above-mentioned work—all of "Old Russian," Kievan and post-Kievan civilization, in the perspective of the subsequent historical and cultural evolution of Ukraine.

I would like to add to these scholarly considerations another, of a political character, which could have a significant effect on future cultural developments. Today, from the ashes of the Soviet empire, new entities have emerged that are culturally well defined and which possess well-established political individuality. From this point of view, too, we are obliged not to lag behind the times, to make up for lost time, and to measure up to these emerging yet ancient realities with the panoply of methodology and seriousness of effort that they deserve.

Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza"

Translated from the Italian by Myroslaw A. Cizdyn

REFERENCES

Ademollo, U. 1939. Paesi dell'Europa Orientale, l'Ucraina. *Le vie del Mondo* (Milan), June, 531–51.

Aillaud, L. and S. Pozzani. 1941. *Ucraina. Cenni storici ed economici.* Milan.

Baracchi Bavagnoli, M. 1989. Il retaggio umanistico nella "Poetica" di Feofan Prokopovič. In *Dalla forma allo spirito. Scritti in onore di Nina Kaucišvili*, edited by R. Casari, U. Persi, and G. P. Piretto, 15–24. Milan.

Bondioli, R. 1939. *Ucraina terra martire e indomita.* Milan (reprinted as: *Ucraina terra del pane.* Milan, 1941).

Cipriani, L. 1934. Gli Hutzuli. *Le vie del mondo*, April.

Colucci, M. and R. Picchio. 1990. Russa, Lingua e Letteratura. In *Grande Dizionario Enciclopedico U.T.E.T.* 17:903–10.

Conforto, G. 1938. L'economia dell'Ucraina e gli scambi commerciali con l'Italia. *Economia italiana* (Rome), 101–108.

Cronia, A. 1958. *La conoscenza del mondo slavo in Italia.* Padua.

Damiani, E. 1939. Il "Figlio di calzolaio". Poeta Nazionale Ucraino. *La Tribuna*, 31 May.

De Luca, B. 1938. Le risorse agrarie dell'Ucraina. *Nuova Antologia*, 16 March.

Documenta. 1952. *Documenta romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae.* Rome (in progress).

Erčić V. 1980. *Manuil (Michail) Kozačinskij i njegova Tragedokomedija.* Novi Sad-Belgrade.

Ettilinger-Fano, M. 1921. *Marussia di Vovciok.* Turin: Paravia et C.

Fedoronczuk, W. 1955. *Il problema ucraino attraverso la storia.* Rome.

———. 1966a. *L'Ucraina sotto il giogo di Mosca.* Rome.

———. 1966b. *Letteratura ucraina in catene.*

Franceschini, G. M. 1921. *Italia e Ucraina. Per una intesa economico-politica italo-ucraina.* Rome.

Gafenko, T. Galip. 1921. L'indipendenza dell'Ucraina nel Trattato di Riga e il punto di vista dei nazionalisti ucraini. *L'Europa Orientale*, June, 50–52.

Giusti, W. 1924. Letteratura popolare ucraina. *I Nostri Quaderni* 3.

———. 1926. Letteratura ucraina. *I Nostri Quaderni* 6.

———. 1926. La Russia Subcarpatica e la sua letteratura. *Rivista di letterature slave* 1:113–38.

———. 1927. Note sul poeta ucraino Ticina. *Rivista di letterature slave* 2:291–93.

Giraudo, G. 1992. La Piccola Russia, il Grande Fratello e il Santo Padre. *Ricerche Slavistiche* 28:201–55.

Gobbi Belcredi, A. M. 1935. La Russia Subcarpatica. *Le vie del mondo*, June.

———. 1939. La Rutenia ex-Russia subcarpatica. *Le vie del mondo*, May.

Graciotti, S. 1983. La polonistica in Italia. In Graciotti, S. and K. Żaboklicki, *La polonistica in Italia e l'italianistica in Polonia. 1945–1976*, Accademia Polacca delle scienze, Conferenze 86, 3–13. Rome.

Grande, S. 1936. La Repubblica Socialista Sovietica dell'Ucraina. In *Russia Europea e Stati baltici* 212–37. Milan.

Italico. 1927. L'indipendenza nazionale ucraina. *La stirpe*, August.

Jeremiew, M. 1929. La questione ucraina all 'epoca del risorgimento italiano. *L'Europa Orientale.*

Lazzarino, B. 1935. La letteratura ucraina nelle sue alterne vicende. *Rassegna nazionale*, February, 118–21.

Lo Gatto, E. 1958. La letteratura ucraina. In *Storia delle letterature moderne d'Europa e d'America*, 249–59. Milan.

———. 1975. *Profilo della letteratura russa dalle origini a Solženicyn.* Milan.

Magnino, L. 1939. La colonizzazione ucraina nell'Asia Orientale. *Universo*, April.

Maver, G. 1931. La slavistica italiana nel decennio passato e i suoi compiti futuri. *Rivista di letterature slave* 6:6–16.

Mercanzin, S. 1989. *Aurelio Palmieri e il suo contributo alla conoscenza dell'Oriente Cristiano ed in particolare della Chiesa russa*. Rome.

Messina, G. L. 1952. *La letteratura belorussa*. Florence.

Monumenta. 1964–1975. *Monumenta Ucrainae historica.* 12 vols. Rome.

Morandi, B. 1991. La trappola del principio di nazionalità. *La Rocca* 21:17.

Onatskyj, E. 1937. *Grammatica ucraina teorico-pratica*. Naples.

———. 1939. *Studi di storia e di cultura ucraina*. Rome.

———. 1941. *Vocabolario ucraino-italiano*. Rome (2nd ed. 1977).

———. 1977. *Vocabolario italiano-ucraino*. Rome.

Palmieri, A. 1911–13. *Theologia dogmatica Orthodoxa (Ecclesiae graeco-russicae) ad lumen Catholicae doctrinae examinata et discussa.* Florence.

———. 1924. La storia letteraria della Rutenia. *Lo spettatore italiano—Rivista letteraria dell'Italia nuova* 7:69–75.

———. 1926. La geografia politica dell'Ukraina sovietista. *L'Europa Orientale* 2:65–81.

———. 1926. La Bjelorussia sovietista. *L'Europa orientale* 3:129–41.

Peri, V. 1988–89. La brama e lo zelo della Fede del popolo chiamato "Rhos." Proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12–13 (1988–89): 114–31.

———1991. I precedenti storici ed ecclesiologici dell'Unione di Brest. In *Il battesimo delle terre russe, bilancio di un millennio*, edited by Sante Graciotti, 323–34. Florence.

Picchio, R. 1970. L'Europa orientale dal Rinascimento all'età illuministica. Milan.

Pritsak, O. 1985. O. Atanasij Velykyj, ČSVV—arxeohraf. *Analecta OSBM*, 58–68.

Pullé, G. 1942. *L'Ucraina*. Rome.

Rossaro, M. 1920. Un poeta ignorato (Scevcenko). *Gran Mondo* 7 (April).

Salvini, L. 1941. *Le quattro sciabole*. Florence.

———. 1949. *L'altopiano dei pastori*. Rome.

Scrimali, C. 1938. *La regione autonoma della Rutenia dopo il trattato di S. Germano. La Rutenia all'Ungheria.*

Senyk, S. 1991. Uniatism and Universalism in the Life and Activity of Metropolitan Joseph Veljamin Rutskyj. In *Il battesimo delle terre russe, bilancio di un millennio*, edited by Sante Graciotti, 335–44. Florence.

Sgambati, E. 1983. Il ruolo dei ruteni nelle edizioni seicentesche dei libri liturgici glagolitico-croati. In *Barocco in Italia e nei paesi slavi del Sud*, edited by Vittore Branca e Sante Graciotti, 431–51. Florence.

———. 1991. Ucrainistica e ucraini "romani" nei secc. XVII–XVIII. In *Itinerari di idee, uomini e cose fra Est ed Ovest europeo*, edited by Maria Luisa Ferrazzi, 241–48. Udine.

Shevelov, G. Y. 1985. *Two Orthodox Ukrainian Churchmen of the Early Eighteenth Century: Teofan Prokopovych and Stefan Iavors'kyi.* The Millennium Series, Ukrainian Studies Fund, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Singalevitc, V. 1922. *La questione della Galizia*. Rome.

Tamborra, A. 1973. *L'Europa centro-orientale nei secoli XIX–XX.* 2 vols. Milan.

———. 1986. *Studi storici sull'Europa orientale, raccolti per il 70mo compleanno dell' autore.* Edited by Rita Tolomeo, Francesco Guida, and Attilio Chitarin. Rome.

Trevisanno, G. 1939. La questione Ucraina e l'interesse europeo. *La Vita italiana* (Rome), 531–51.

Wolkonsky, A. 1929. Come la storia della Russia premongolica può divenire una questione di attualità. *L'Europa Orientale* 3–4 (9): 93–117.

———. 1929a. "Russ" del Sud e "Russ" del Nord. *L'Europa Orientale* 3-4 (9):203–13.